

CONCERNING INNER ATTENTION

(ΠΡΟΣΟΧΗ - ΝΗΨΙΣ)

Constantine Cavernos

Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

In the Gospels, and in other writings of the New Testament, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul, a clear and emphatic distinction is made between man as he generally *is*, and man as he *ought to be*. St. Paul uses the terms the "old man" and the "new man" to vividly designate this distinction. Man as he is, is regarded as very imperfect as regards his inner being. He is regarded as falling far short of what he ought to be, far short of the perfection to which he has been destined. His mind, heart, conscience, etc. are shown to be in need of radical *change, purification, renewal*.

The Gospels and the other New Testament writings not only distinguish sharply the "old man" from the "new man," but also indicate the *practical methods or means* whereby the transition from the old to the new man may be effected; they show in bold outline the *way* which must be followed by those who desire to effect this change, by those who have come to a deep realization of their defects, of their shortcomings, and want to overcome them, want to change their inner being.

One of the practical methods clearly indicated by Christ and the Apostle Paul for changing ourselves, for evolving psychologically, spiritually, is the method of inner attention, watchfulness, or wakefulness. It is this that I shall discuss in the present paper. This practice, as will become evident during the course of our discussion, is one of the most powerful means of inner change, of self-perfection. Yet, strangely, it is one that Christians have always tended to neglect, and one which in modern times has become something almost totally unknown.

Christ frequently speaks of inner attention or wakefulness, and stresses the need of practicing it. He refers to men, including His disciples, as being *asleep*, and enjoins them to become *awake, attentive*. The word "sleep" (καθεύδειν) is used in a num-

ber of senses in the Gospels: sometimes it refers to sleep in the ordinary sense, i.e. bodily sleep; sometimes, to death; and sometimes to mental sleep or, more precisely, to the absence of inner attention or watchfulness. It is used in the last sense in the remarkable incident of the vigil at Gethsemane. Before He goes to pray, Christ says to Peter, James, and John: "Remain here and *keep awake*" (γρηγορεῖτε). Upon returning, however, He finds them "*sleeping*" (καθεύδοντας), and again enjoins them "*Become awake and pray*, that you may not enter into temptation." He goes and prays again, and upon returning finds them again "*asleep*." (Matt. 26. 38-43; Mark 14. 34-40.) Elsewhere, speaking to His disciples about "the signs of the end," Christ exhorts them: "*Watch*" (βλέπετε), "*keep sleepless*" (ἀγρυπνεῖτε), "*keep awake*" (γρηγορεῖτε). (Mark 13. 33-37; cf. Luke 21. 34-36.) Again, Christ says: "*Look* (προσέχετε) that you do not practice your piety before men in order to be seen by them" (Matt. 6. 1). He is pointing out here the need of watching our motives and seeing that we do not perform externally good acts from motives which are not good. And again, Christ says: "*Take heed to yourselves*" (προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς). If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him; and if he sins against you seven times in the day, and turns to you seven times, and says, 'I repent,' you must forgive him" (Luke 17. 3-4). Reference is made here to attitudes. We should watch our attitudes towards others, and see that we adopt the right attitudes. Let me give one more example from the Gospels. Christ says: "*Take heed to yourselves* lest your hearts be weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and cares of this life" (Luke 21. 34). Here we are told to pay attention to our "heart," and guard it against various factors that tend to weigh it down.

It is apparent that various words are employed in the Gospels to refer to the practice of inner attention or wakefulness. Sometimes the term γρηγορεῖτε (keep awake, become awake) is used; sometimes, ἀγρυπνεῖτε (be sleepless, wakeful); sometimes, βλέπετε (look, watch); sometimes, προσέχετε (pay attention, watch, take heed). In some passages, two or more of these words are employed, in an effort to make the injunctions clear and emphatic. The English versions of the New Testament often do not render these terms too precisely; hence, in such cases I have made my own translation.

St. Paul, too, speaks frequently of inner attention, using terms that appear in the Gospels, as well as other, related ones. In his letter to the Ephesians, for instance, he says: "*Awake* (ἐγείρε), O sleeper (καθεύδων), and *arise* from the dead, and Christ shall give you light. *Look* (βλέπετε) carefully how you walk, not as unwise men, but as wise" (5. 14-15). And later on this epistle he says: "*Be sleepless* (ἀγρυπνεῖτε) with all perseverance" (6. 18). Similarly, in his letter to the Thessalonians, he writes: "So then let us *not sleep* (μὴ καθεύδωμεν), as others do, but let us *keep awake* (γρηγορῶμεν) and *be watchful* (νήφωμεν). For those who

sleep sleep at night, and those who get drunk are drunk at night. But, since we belong to the day, let us be *wakeful*" (1 Thess. 5. 6-8). And elsewhere he says: "Continue steadfastly in prayer, *being awake in it*" (γρηγοροῦντες). (Col. 4. 2.) Again, he says: "Pray at all times in the Spirit, with all prayer and supplication. To that end *keep sleepless* (ἀγρυπνοῦντες) with all perseverance" (Eph. 6. 18).

It is evident, from the passages which I have quoted, and from other, similar ones, that both Christ and Paul consider men's ordinary, so-called "waking consciousness," as being really a state of sleep in relation to a higher level of consciousness of which they are capable, but to which they seldom rise. Further, it is evident that Christ and Paul regard this higher level of consciousness as being something very salutary, protecting us from undesirable influences, from temptations, passions, unnecessary cares; and hence something we should prize and strive constantly to attain or retain. And, further, it is clear that they relate inner attention or wakefulness to *prayer* and regard the two as being connected in an important way. Christ says: "Become awake and pray, that you may not enter into temptation." He does not say simply: "Pray, that you may not enter into temptation," but *Become awake and pray . . .*," thereby making it clear that prayer *without* attention *cannot* achieve this. Similarly, the Apostle Paul says: "Continue steadfastly in prayer, *keeping awake in it*." It is worth noting that this precept is given also by Peter: "*Be wakeful* in your prayers," he enjoins (1 Peter 4. 7). Clearly, then, they teach that attention or wakefulness is a necessary condition for effective prayer; that to overcome temptation, to achieve inner purity, to progress spiritually, we must make a combined use of prayer and attention.

† † †

The Apostolic Fathers, that is, the Church writers who flourished immediately after the period of the Apostles, also speak of attention or inner watchfulness. Ignatius, for instance, in his letter to Polycarp, exhorts him: "*Keep awake*" (γρηγόρει), *keep the spirit sleepless* (ἀκοίμητον). (I. 3.) And Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippians, exhorts them to "*be wakeful*" (νήφοντες) in their prayers" (VII. 2).

Brief references to attention, not always helpful, are to be found scattered in the writings of many subsequent Christian Fathers. Those who have provided rich, extremely valuable commentaries on the New Testament teaching on the subject are the Greek Fathers who may be characterized as ascetic-mystical or "wakeful" (νήπτικοί). Writings of many of these Fathers have been collected by Nicodemos of the Holy Mountain (or Mt. Athos)

and Macarios, Bishop of Corinth, in the book entitled *Philokalia* (Φιλοκαλία), which was first published in 1782. These Greek Fathers refer frequently to the practice of wakefulness, and many of them have written special treatises on the subject. Their works show extraordinary psychological understanding and contain many insights of great value, not to be found in modern books on psychology. They provide clear and very illuminating answers to such questions as the following: What is wakefulness or inner attention? Of what value is it to us? How is it related to our various faculties or powers? How can it be acquired?

Their teaching on this, as on other subjects, has been developed with constant reference to the Holy Scriptures. It is the fruit of the constant and zealous study of them with a desire to penetrate to the very depths of their teachings, and also from the rich experience and the spiritual insights which resulted from a life ordered in strict conformity to them.

In speaking of wakefulness or attention, they use sometimes one term, sometimes another, sometimes several together, as in the case of the Scriptures. "This same work," says St. Symeon the New Theologian, who is one of the most outstanding teachers of attention, "some of our Fathers have called *quietness* (ἡσυχία) of the heart; others have named it *attention* (προσοχή); others, *wakefulness* (νήψις) and opposition (ἀντίρροησις); and others, an *observation* (ἐρευνα) of thoughts and a *guarding of the mind*" (φύλαξις νοός). (Φιλοκαλία, second ed., 1893, Vol II, p. 515.) Similarly, Nicephoros the Solitary, another outstanding exponent of attention, remarks: "As regards *attention* (προσοχή), some of the saints have called it a *watching over the mind* (νοός τήρησις); others, a *guarding of the heart* (καρδιακή φυλακή); others, *wakefulness* (νήψις); others, *mental quietness* (νοερά ἡσυχία); and others, otherwise. But all these terms mean one and the same thing" (Φιλοκαλία II, 240).

By inner attention, the Greek "Wakeful Fathers" mean a state of the rational faculty or mind in which the mind is *awake*, *alert*, *observative* of everything that takes place within oneself - - of one's passions, thoughts, fantasies, attitudes, motives, etc. The state which is directly opposed to this, which is a privation of it, is referred to as "sleep," as in the Holy Scriptures. Thus, St. Isaac of Syria remarks: "The wise man says, become awake (ἐγρήγορος) and sober-and-wary (νηφάλιος), for the sake of your life; for sleep of the mind is an image of actual death" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 399). And Hesychios of Jerusalem speaks of "sleep of the soul" (ὕπνος τῆς ψυχῆς) as something death-bearing; and he quotes the prayer of David: "Lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death" (Φιλοκαλία, I, 94).

Attention is an activity of the rational faculty, which in principle is the leader and master of the soul as well as of the body. St. Macarios the Great remarks: "The soul, having a discrim-

inative part, which governs the whole soul together with the body, ought to guard it and its garment, the body, from all sides, with wakefulness and courage and earnestness and attention" (Ὁμιλῖαι πνευματικαί, IV, ed. Soterios N. Schoinas, 1954). And Hesychios says: "The work of wisdom is to move the thinking power of the soul to strict and complete wakefulness and to spiritual contemplation" (Φιλοκαλία, I, 85). Again, St. Symeon the New Theologian says: "You must watch in this manner within yourself with your mind" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 516). And again, Abba Mark speaks of a "wonderful method, employing an attentive mind" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 228).

In attention, the mind is serene and steady, and acts as an alert "doorkeeper" to the whole inner self. Hence, Nicephoros the Solitary calls attention "the serenity of the mind, or rather its standing firmly" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 240). And Hesychios writes: "Watchfulness is the steadfast gathering together of the mind, and its taking its stand firmly at the door of the heart" (Φιλοκαλία, I, 83). Again, St. Anthony the Great says: "The mind of God-loving men acts as a watchful doorkeeper (φυλακός), barring the entrance to bad and ugly thoughts" (Φιλοκαλία, I, 4). The term *doorkeeper* is of special interest, not only because it indicates vividly the nature of the activity, but also because Christ Himself employs it in speaking of wakefulness. In the 13th chapter of Mark, where He is described as exhorting His disciples to become and to keep awake, attentive, he is quoted as saying: "It is like a man on a journey, when he leaves home and puts his servants in charge, each with his work, and commands the doorkeeper (θυρωρός) to keep awake and watch" (33-34). It is worth noting that the concept of a mental doorkeeper has entered, although in a mutilated and distorted form, into the teachings of contemporary psychoanalysts, such as S. Freud, who speaks of a "psychic censor."

The Greek Fathers speak of attention sometimes as a "watching of the *mind*" and sometimes as a "watching of the *heart*." Actually, they regard it as being both. Thus, Hesychios says: "The virtue of attention consists in the guarding of the mind, the watching of the mind, and in achieving sweet quietness of the heart" (Φιλοκαλία, I, 92). The mind needs to be guarded, as well as the heart. The mind has a number of distinguishable functions, and can act as both subject and object; it can adopt an objective, detached attitude towards its own activities, and not merely towards the other faculties and activities of man. Such an attitude is needed with regard to its powers of discursive reason, imagination, and passion. I have elsewhere discussed the need of curbing the activity of discursive reason,¹ and shall therefore discuss here only the imagination and the passions of the mind. As regards the former, St. Gregory of Sinai says: "The

1. "The Nature and Proper Uses of Reason," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. I, No. 1, (August, 1954, p. 37).

mind has in itself the power of imagining (τὸ φανταστικόν) and can easily build images of what it desires, in those who do not pay attention to this, and so cause them harm" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 277). He and the other "Wakeful Fathers" frequently speak of the imagination and its harmful effects, and stress the need of controlling it, of keeping the mind, so far as possible, free of fantasies (ὑπάνταστον). Through fantasies, the mind is dispersed, it moves from the intelligible and spiritual to the sensory and fictitious, passions are aroused, and we are led astray. Imagination, thus understood, is one of the chief sources of weakness in man, of man's helplessness. Accordingly, some of the Greek Fathers, such as Maximos the Confessor and Nicodemos of the Holy Mountain, explicitly assert that imagination is one of the results of transgression, that before transgression the mind did not have the power or activity of the imagination (Nicodemos, (Ἐγγχειρίδιον, second ed., 1885, p. 105).

The mind must also be cleansed of all passions. The mind has its own distinctive emotions, both those that are positive, constructive, desirable, and those that are negative, destructive, undesirable. The latter are termed "passions" (πάθη). A long list of them is given by St. Gregory of Sinai. "The passions of intuitive reason" (νοῦς), he says, "are conceit, haughtiness, boasting, contentiousness, rivalry, self-satisfaction, objecting, disobedience, fantasy, fabrication, love of showing off, love of fame, pride—the first and last of all evils. The passions of discursive reason (διάνοια) are wandering, doubting, various forms of slavery, darkening of thoughts, blindness, evasions, suggestibility, identification with the objects suggested, inclinations, changing, distorting, and the like" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 250). It is evident that in our attempts to purify the mind, to "renew" it, as St. Paul says, we should *observe* these passions, should *detach* the mind from them, instead of allowing it to be identified with them, should *oppose* them as foreign intruders, as enemies. This is what wakefulness or attention with reference to the "passions" means.

The more our mind is freed, through attention and prayer—prayer is essential for this, as we shall presently see—from vain reasonings, imaginings, and passions, the more effectively it can attend to what is needful and essential; the more powerful an instrument it becomes of attention, prayer, and contemplation.

Attention is needed no less by the "heart." The Eastern Fathers often refer to Christ's statements that it is "out of the heart that come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander," and that "these are what defile a man" (Matt. 15. 19, 20). The heart ought to be purified. Its purification is essential for the perception of spiritual truths, for the acquisition of a higher kind of knowledge, transcending that which is acquired through the activity of the senses and the brain; it is essential for the contemplation of God. The writers to whom I am referring stress this, and often remind us of Christ's

statement: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

The purification of the heart consists in the elimination from it of passions, of bad motives and attitudes, of evil thoughts. This elimination is to be achieved by means of attention combined with prayer. To be effective, these two practices must be combined. Neither prayer without attention, nor attention without prayer can lead to inner purification. Through attention alone we can observe the undesirable things in us, we can oppose them and neutralize them, but we cannot overcome and exterminate them. Only when attention is accompanied by prayer can we achieve the latter. On the other hand, prayer without attention, i.e., mechanical prayer, is futile. Nothing can be achieved by prayer during which, as Theoleptos observes, "your mouth says one thing and your mind is dreaming about another (*Φιλοκαλία*, I, 349), and during which your heart remains unguarded by attention. St. Symeon the New Theologian sums up his teachings on the necessity of attention for effective prayer with the following statement: "If by means of attention we keep prayer pure, we make progress; but if we do not use attention to keep it pure, but leave it unguarded, it becomes defiled by evil thoughts and we fail, we make no progress" (*Φιλοκαλία*, II, 513). "Let the mind," therefore, he says, "guard the heart when it is praying" (*Φιλοκαλία*, II, 515).

The Greek ascetic-mystical Fathers relate the practice of attention to conscience (*συνείδησις*), too. They show the necessity of turning our attention to conscience and doing what it dictates, to the point that it will censure us in nothing. Further they teach that conscience may be in a clouded, impure state; indeed, may be, for all practical purposes, "dead," i.e. wholly separated from the rest of one's self, submerged in the unconscious. But they hold that through attention, conscience can be cleansed of the elements that cloud it, that obstruct its activity, that keep it isolated and inoperative. Thus, Philotheos of Sinai says: "Wakefulness distinctly purifies conscience; and conscience having been purified, at once shines like a light which had been covered up, and drives away the great darkness which surrounded it. And when the darkness has been dispelled through frequent and earnest wakefulness, conscience again shows all that had remained unnoticed" (*Φιλοκαλία*, I, 371). Again, he remarks: "Let us not be led astray by false reasoning regarding conscience, for it tells us what things lead to our salvation and ought to be done; it tells us incessantly what are our duties and obligations, especially when it has been purified by active, applied, subtle watchfulness of the mind" (*Φιλοκαλία*, I, 372). And St. Isaiah the Anchorite says: "Let us not put any obstacles in the way of our conscience, but keep our attention upon ourselves, in fear of God, until it, too, is freed and a union (*ένωσις*) between it and us is effected" (*Φιλοκαλία*, I, 18).

Because attention has these important applications, and an-

other one, not discussed here, *viz.* the guarding of the senses, the ascetic-mystical Fathers of the East speak of it not only as a *virtue*, but as *the way to every virtue*. St. Symeon the New Theologian, who on this, as on many other points, gives a masterly epitome of their teaching, writes: "Our Holy Fathers were convinced that through this work (attention), they would easily acquire every other virtue, but without it no virtue can be acquired and become firmly established" (Φιλοκαλία, II, 515). They therefore sought to impress upon others the importance of the practice of attention and, by means both of the spoken and, so far as this was possible, of the written word, to transmit the knowledge of this master art. They realized that such knowledge cannot be transmitted adequately by means of writing, but requires a living teacher. In their writings they explain, in greater or lesser detail, the nature of inner attention, its applications, and the general conditions most favorable for achieving success in it. But they indicate the necessity of an experienced, competent guide, who will supplement the instructions given in their writings with more definite, personal instructions, and will help one avoid various kinds of misunderstandings and errors in one's attempts to practice inner attention.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE DECLARATION OF THE ORTHODOX DELEGATES CONCERNING FAITH AND ORDER

As delegates of the Orthodox Church participating at this Assembly of the World Council of Churches, we submit the following statement concerning the Report of Section I.

1. We have studied the document with considerable interest. It falls into three parts: the first contains an able exposition of the New Testament doctrine of the Church. The organic character of the Church and her indissoluble unity with Christ are adequately stressed in the document. We feel that this at least provides fruitful ground for further theological elaboration. The second and third parts of the document deal with the divided state of Christendom and suggest practical steps toward union. It is our conviction that it does not follow logically and consistently from the first part and indeed if we do actually accept the New Testament doctrine of the Church we should come to quite different practical conclusions which have been familiar to us Orthodox for centuries. The whole approach to the problem of reunion is entirely unacceptable from the standpoint of the Orthodox Church.

2. The Orthodox conception of Church unity implies a two-fold agreement:

a. The whole of the Christian Faith should be regarded as one, indivisible unity. It is not enough to accept just certain, particular doctrines as basic as they may be in themselves, e.g. that Christ is God and Savior. It is necessary that all doctrines as formulated by the Ecumenical Councils, as well as the totality of the teachings of the Early, Undivided Church, should be accepted. One cannot be satisfied with formulas which are isolated from the life and experience of the Church. They must be assessed and understood within the context of the Church's life. From the Orthodox viewpoint re-union of Christendom with which the World Council of Churches is concerned can be achieved solely on the basis of the total dogmatic Faith of the Early, Undivided Church without either subtraction or alteration. We cannot accept a rigid distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines, and there is no room for comprehensiveness in the Faith. On the other hand, the Orthodox Church cannot accept that the Holy Spirit speaks to us only through the Bible. The Holy Spirit abides and witnesses through the totality of the Church's life and experience. The Bible is given to us within the context of Apostolic Tradition in which in turn we possess the authentic interpretation and explication of the Word of God. Loyalty to Apostolic tradition safeguards the reality and continuity of Church unity.

b. It is through the Apostolic Ministry that the mystery of Pentecost is perpetuated in the Church. The Episcopal Succession from the Apostles constitutes an historical reality in the life and structure of the Church and one of the pre-suppositions

of her unity through the ages. The unity of the Church is preserved through the unity of the Episcopate. The Church is one Body whose historical continuity and unity is also safeguarded by the common faith arising spontaneously out of the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the Church.

3. Thus, when we are considering the problem of Church unity, we cannot envisage it in any other way than as the complete restoration of the total faith and the total Episcopal structure of the Church which is basic to the sacramental life of the Church. We would not pass judgment upon those of the separated communions. However, it is our conviction that in these communions certain basic elements are lacking which constitute the reality of the fullness of the Church. We believe that the return of the communions to the Faith of the ancient, united, and indivisible Church of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, namely, to the pure and unchanged and common heritage of the forefathers of all divided Christians, shall alone produce the desired re-union of all separated Christians. For only the unity and the fellowship of Christians in a common Faith shall have as a necessary result their fellowship in the sacraments and their indissoluble unity in love, as members of one and the same Body of the one Church of Christ.

4. The "perfect unity" of Christians must not be interpreted exclusively as a realization at the Second Coming of Christ. We must acknowledge that even at the present age the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church, continues to breathe in the world, guiding all Christians to unity. The unity of the Church must not be understood only eschatologically, but as a present reality which is to receive its consummation in the Last Day.

5: It is suggested in the Report of this Section that the road which the Church must take in restoring unity is that of repentance. We recognize that there have been and are imperfections and failures within the life and witness of Christian believers, but we reject the notion that the Church herself, being the Body of Christ and the repository of revealed Truth and the "whole operation of the Holy Spirit", could be affected by human sin. Therefore, we cannot speak of the repentance of the Church which is intrinsically holy and unerring. For, "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify it and cleanse it with the washing of water and by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:26-27).

Thus the Lord, the only Holy One, sanctified His Church forever and ordained that her task be the "edification of the saints and the building of the Body of Christ". Her holiness is not vitiated by the sins and failures of her members. They cannot in any way lessen or exhaust the inexhaustible holiness of the divine life which from the Head of the Church is diffused throughout all the Body.

6. In conclusion, we are bound to declare our profound conviction that the Holy Orthodox Church alone has preserved in full and intact "the faith once delivered unto the saints". It is not because of our human merit, but because it pleases God to preserve "his treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God". (2 Cor. 4:7)

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE DIVISION OF CHRISTENDOM AND POSSIBILITIES OF REUNION

John N. Karmiris

University of Athens

On July, 1954—nine hundred years after the Schism—we were reminded of the most deplorable event in the history of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ, the division of Christendom into two sections, namely the Eastern Church of the Orthodox and the Western Church of the Latins. It was on the 16th of July 1054 that the Latin delegation of Pope Leo IX arrived in Constantinople, mainly possessed with political motives, and ventured a move which proved to be fatal to the unity of the Christian Church. The Latin delegation announced formally the excommunication of the Patriarch of Constantinople and of the whole Eastern Church on grounds that were both unjustifiable and anti-canonical. This excommunication marked the final schism between East and West, which was already sufficiently prepared during the preceding centuries as a result of various factors and motives which eventually culminated in the unavoidable separation. This unfortunate ecclesiastical schism tore in two the unseamed robe of our Saviour by dividing His One Catholic Church into two, our own Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches. This division not only continues up to this day but becomes even more acute day by day as a result of the Reformation of the 16th century, at which time an appreciable number of religious groups in protest separated themselves from the Catholic Church. They in turn, suffering further division, multiplied to the extent that nowadays they number more than 250 smaller groups.

May I state at the outset, that the writing of this paper on the occasion of the completion of nine centuries of schism, has been prompted by my devotion and duty to my Orthodox Church. My purpose is to a) reinterpret the facts in their true perspective and meaning with regard to the real cause of the Schism, b) draw from the events connected with the Schism the directives which would help to effect the reunion of the separated sister-Churches, at which time the Spirit of Pentecost would again be called to

unify the divided Church, c) indicate a way and method to be followed in the effort to bring about the much-desired reunion of Christendom. Our study, therefore, will deal first with the inner causes of the Schism and of the events leading to it, secondly with the excommunication of the Eastern Church by her sister in the West, and thirdly with the most beneficial approach to the problem of reunion, according to the Orthodox standpoint.

I

The year 1054 stands rather as a symbol of the completion of the Schism whereas in reality it is the inevitable conclusion and end of long standing differences and estrangement between the two Churches, each ignoring and distrusting the other. It is beyond doubt that both intellectual and ecclesiastical differences existing between the Greeks and the Latins had prepared gradually the Schism. Besides these, racial and political differences connected with the transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople by Constantine the Great must also be taken into consideration as contributing factors to the separation. In fact, the beginning and sources of the Schism can be found arising even before this time, going as far back as the Roman occupation of Greece in pre-Christian times, and the establishment of the first Greek colonies on Italian and Gallic soil. To these differences serious dogmatical divergences between the Eastern and Western Churches were later added, two being the most important; namely, the absolute authority in jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome, and the procession of the Holy Spirit (*filioque*) from the Son. Both these differences certainly played an important part in the genesis of the ecclesiastical Schism. We accordingly consider all these differences to be the principal, deep and real causes of the Schism, while, on the contrary, the events and the protagonists of the Schism in the ninth and eleventh centuries, both at its inception and its completion, were only trivial contributing factors to the Schism which sooner or later would have been inevitable, inasmuch as the actualization of the Schism depended upon persons not imbued with the Christian spirit of love. It is obvious that the causes and pretexts of the Schism should not be confused as often done.

In particular, we ought to connect some of the inner causes of the Schism with the intellectual and ecclesiastical differences between Greeks and Latins, and in their particular trends of theological thought as expressed, on the one hand, by the philosophically minded Fathers of the Eastern Church, and, on the other, by the Fathers of the West who were known for their methodical and practical approach. Differences of this kind are apparent even in the writings of the Alexandrine theologians as against the writings of Tertullian, representing the Western

thought, and continue during the following centuries to permeate all expressions of theological thought, the Eastern thought being influenced by Platonic trends, the Western by Aristotelian. As a result both Churches, Eastern and Western, developed independently each in its own way in the fields of theological speculation, ecclesiastical organization, and divine worship, with little or no mutual understanding. This differentiation between the two Churches, begun already during the early period of Christianity, was later completely effected by the excessive use on the part of the Roman Church of rationalism and scholasticism, and by the Renaissance and Protestant movements which did not influence the Eastern Church, inasmuch as the Eastern Fathers took no part and subscribed to no theological movement of the West. To these differentiating factors between East and West one must add individual differences in temperament and personality between the Christians of East and West, and especially between the Churchmen, as e.g., the different way in which Christianity was understood and practiced by the people of each Church, human weaknesses and personal gain, and above all sin expressed often as a strife for honor, primacy, secular power, and selfish ambition, traits that go back to the very Apostolic period ("And an argument arose among them as to which of them was the greatest." Luke 19, 46.). As a result of these gradually developing differences the two Churches became estranged to each other. Jealousies, and the desire to govern the whole Church expressed in the struggle for primacy among the Patriarchal sees contributed appreciably in widening the gap between the two Churches. Special mention must be made here of the struggle between the Pope of Rome and the Patriarch of Constantinople as representing the opposition between the two worlds standing behind the two bishops. The first disagreement between East and West seems to have arisen on account of the decisions of the 2nd and 4th Ecumenical Councils, which bestowed equal privileges to the Patriarch of Constantinople as those which the bishop of Rome had earlier enjoyed, "on the ground that Constantinople had become the New Rome . . . (the Fathers) rightly decided that the City which was honored with the Imperium and Senate should enjoy equal rights with the senior sovereign city of Rome, and be equally honored as well in church affairs and ecclesiastical government, being second after her . . . and because (the Fathers) justifiably gave honors to the senior city of Rome for the reason that she was the seat of the Empire."¹

But most significant was the first real schism between the East and the West which lasted 35 years (484-519), and which was caused by Zeno's *Henotikon*, issued with the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople Acacius. To that the Image Controversy may be added. Furthermore, the antithesis and dis-

1. See John Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, (Athens, 1952), vol. I, pp. 136, 166.

sension between the Eastern and Western Churches became deeper and more official on account of the Canons 36, 38, 13, 55 and 56 of the Quinisext Council (Trullan) in 692, by which the primacy rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople were again recognized and the obligatory celibacy of the clergy and the fast of the Latins on the Saturdays of Lent were condemned.² Finally, the uncanonical addition of the "filioque" to the Creed contributed much to the Schism. This addition concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit "and from the son", was rightly considered to be a serious innovation on the part of the Roman Church, because in essence it changes the meaning of the fundamental Christian dogma of the Holy Trinity and constitutes an illegitimate interpolation in the text of the sacred Creed of the Church which was originally ordained by the Ecumenical Councils to remain forever unchanged and unforged, even to the extent of changing one word of the text or a syllable.³ These and other causes were instrumental in effecting a split in the ecclesiastical communion between old and new Rome. M. Jugie totals 217 years of separation, dating from 337 to 843;⁴ L. Duchesne totals 203 years from 323 to 787.⁵ However exaggerated these numbers may seem, they denote in truth an unpleasant reality which prepared the final division and separation of the two great branches of Christendom.

In addition to the intellectual, theological and ecclesiastical differences, it is also necessary to add the racial, national and political antitheses and antipathies which existed before Christ between the Greeks and the Romans; later, between the Christian Emperors of Byzantium and the Popes of Rome. And as for the differences between the ancient Greeks and Romans it was natural for enmity to develop, mainly because of mutual conquests and the conflict between their national and economic interests. This was intensified by significant differences in respect to culture, spirit, language, national, religious and social character of their life, manners and customs. This dissension continued, unfortunately, even after Christ when the capital was transferred to Byzantium. The bishops of Rome, then, having seen that Byzantium began to grow as an ecclesiastical and political centre, not only became envious of its development but they began to try to invest themselves with the double authority of their predecessors, as "pontifices maximi", and rulers of the Roman Empire, so that they may exercise, within the Church particularly, the old Caesarean imperialism and totalitarianism of ancient Rome under the cloak of Papo-Cesarism. To this end, they invented the theory of the so-called Papal supremacy, by which the Pope is bishop of bishops (*episcopus episcoporum*) and

2. John Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 194f. *ibid.* Canons 52, 57 67, 82.

3. Mansi, *Concil.* 5, 308/9.

4. M. Jugie, *Le Schisme Byzantin*, (Paris, 1941), p. 9.

5. L. Duchesne, *Eglises Séparées*, (Paris, 1896), p. 164/5.

the source of all priestly and ecclesiastical authority, the infallible head and prince of the Church governing her singularly as the Vicar of Christ on earth. For, according to the Roman conception, the Christian Church is an absolute monarchy, whose ruler is the Pope called "the Supreme Leader and Head of the Church", her "corner-stone, infallible teacher of the faith, ποιμὴν ποιμένιον, representative of Christ on earth." It is obvious that under these titles the bid of the bishops of Rome for concentration in their hands of absolute authority and appropriation of all the attributes of the Church is concealed for the purpose of governing the whole Church of Christ in an autocratic and tyrannical way. Concealed in this ambition on the part of the bishops of Rome is the struggle for acquisition of secular power as well. Accordingly, in order that these ecclesiastico-political designs of the Pope be realized more easily, they succeeded in emancipating themselves fully from the dominance and jurisdiction of the Emperor of Byzantium, appreciably helped in this by the incoming menace of Mohammedanism, which, after gaining dominance over the eastern Mediterranean and the farthest Asian provinces of Byzantium, isolated to a great extent the West from the East.

Subsequently, the Popes put themselves already from the middle of the eighth century under the protection of the Franks, whose rulers Pepin and Charlemagne they crowned Emperors of the West, in this way establishing the Western Empire and limiting the authority of the Byzantine Emperors within the East which later even fell to the hands of the Christian West through the so-called Crusades, initiated with the blessings of the Papacy. Through such political moves the Popes sought chiefly to put an end to their dependence and to sever their relations with the lawful Roman Emperor in Byzantium, and to vest themselves with political power by creating the conditions and accepting the so-called Papal State in Italy as a gift of the Frankish rulers. So, already one century before Photius, and three centuries before Cerularius, the Popes for the sake of their own ecclesiastico-political ambitions and pursuits had created first the political separation of the West from the East. The ecclesiastical schism unavoidably followed as a necessary and inevitable consequence of this separation.⁶

6. V. Congar, writes: "L'étrangement est ici celui de deux mondes à la fois politiques et culturels: le monde byzantin, qui affirme être la suite légitime de Rome, et la monde barbare latinisé, spirituellement dominé par la Rome apostolique et papale. D'un monde à l'autre, pas d'acceptation: Rome n'accepte pas CP, CP n'accepte pas l'Occident tel qu'il est. et a plutôt le sentiment que, cet Occident a trahi la romanité, telle du moins qu'on la concevait à Byzance, c'est-à-dire impériale." *Irenikon, L'Eglise et les Eglises*. Neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Etudes et travaux, vol. I, p. 22.

II

All the deeper and more remote causes, which we already have set forth in brief, led to the great Latin Ecclesiastical Schism, which though begun in 867 in the time of the bishops Nicholas I of Rome and Photius of Constantinople, was completed in 1054 in the time of the bishops Leo IX of Rome and Michael Cerularius of Constantinople. Thus the Schism went through two stages; in the first of these we have the beginning, because of the uncanonical and extra-jurisdictional double intervention of Pope Nicholas I consisting, on one hand, of his intervention in the Patriarchal election at Constantinople, and, on the other, of his interference in Bulgaria which was christianized and dominated both ecclesiastically and politically by Byzantium. Through these interventions Nicholas I sought to impose the Papal autocratic primacy and to subjugate under the Papal throne of authority the Eastern Church, independent from the beginning and synodically governed by the four Patriarchs (of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem). But the great and wise Ecumenical Patriarch Photius succeeded in checking the designs of Pope Nicholas who thus remains, undoubtedly, the father, prime-mover and perpetrator of the outbreak of the great Schism. Since time does not permit us to deal more extensively with the first stage of the Schism,⁷ we confine ourselves only to point out that contemporary research on the subject, and especially the work of the Roman Catholic theologian Francis Dvornik, have shown that Photius succeeded during his second Patriarchal term to bridge the Schism and restore peace and bring about communion between the Churches of Constantinople and Rome.⁸ Unfortunately, however, peaceful relations lasted only for two hundred years, even then amidst an atmosphere of mutual suspicion and distrust. And in the year 1054 the final split of the two Churches took place.

The historical events of 1054 unfolded in the following manner: About the end of March or early April of that year a delegation of Pope Leo IX arrived in Constantinople under the leadership of the arrogant and intolerant Cardinal Humbert and immediately began political negotiations with the Emperor Constantine Monomachus (1042-1055) intending to close an alliance between him and the Pope against the Normans who were threatening both the Papal and Byzantine possessions in Italy. Cardinal Humbert and the rest of the legates not only postponed for a considerable time to visit the Ecumenical Patriarch Michael Cerularius and pay the customary respects, as they should have, but even when at last the Papal legates called upon the Patriarch they conducted themselves with "pride and arrogance and

7. See further, John Karmiris, *The Schism of the Roman Church*, (Athens, 1950), p. 11f. (English translation by Rev. Z. Xintaras)

8. *ibid.*, p. 28f.

impertinence”⁹ and they delivered to him an unbecoming letter written by Humbert, whose Papal origin and genuineness the Patriarch at once disputed.¹⁰ In addition, they let loose a violent polemic against the Patriarch and all Orthodox, appearing in Constantinople as censors and judges of the Patriarch and as teachers of the Orthodox, claiming that Orthodoxy had been corrupted.¹¹ Humbert had, besides, composed a slanderous and blasphemous libellum, which was distributed in a Greek translation through-out Constantinople. In this Humbert advanced unfounded and false accusations against the Patriarch and the Orthodox Church, claiming that the East was the cradle of all heresies et al.¹² Patriarch Michael agreed to discuss the slanderous accusations of the Latin Cardinal only before a Synod consisting of representatives of all the Patriarchates.¹³ This suggested canonical proceeding was rejected by the Papal legates, who “said that they did not come here to be taught or to argue, but rather to teach and convince us [sc. the Orthodox] to preserve their dogmas; and this they said with authority and excessive shamelessness.”¹⁴ On account of this the Patriarch deemed it right to discontinue any further communication with them, for it seemed that it was impossible to do otherwise, inasmuch as Cardinal Humbert by reason of his ill character was altogether unsuitable for such a mission, as it is now admitted even by contemporary Roman theologians.¹⁵

This being the case, Humbert and the other Latins with him, not cognizant of their obligations toward the unity of the Church and toward their Christian brethren, who were defending their ancestral dogmas and traditions, proceeded according, it seems, to a pre-conceived plan to complete the long standing and continuously growing ecclesiastical division, and boldly and irreverently entered the church of Haghia Sophia while the Patriarch was celebrating the divine liturgy on July 16, 1054, and placed on the altar a blasphemous libellum by which they were excommunicating the entire Orthodox Church and in particular Patriarch Michael.¹⁶ And in the words of Michael the Orthodox were excommunicated for other reasons and particularly “for

9. See I Letter of Cerularius to Patriarch Peter of Antioch in John Karmiris, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, p. 291.

10. *ibid.*, pp. 291-2.

11. See II Letter of Cerularius to Peter, Patriarch of Antioch in Migne, PG 120, 816.

12. C. Will, *Acta et Scripta quae de controversae Eglisiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo unde cimo composita extant*, (Lipsiae, 1861), pp. 93-126. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, No. 7. (1886-7), p. 6f.

13. II Letter of Cerularius to Peter, Migne, PG, 120,816. Will, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

14. I Letter of Cerularius to Peter, Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 294 Migne, PG, 128,16.

15. V. Grumel, in *Unitas*, No. 6, 1954, p. 31.

16. See Libellum in Migne, PG, 120,74-5. C. Will, *op. cit.*, p. 153-4.

not being willing to shave their beards in the fashion of the Latins, or from not discriminating in receiving Communion from married presbyters, and also for offering leavened bread, and for refusing to recite in the Creed, symbol of our faith, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son but insisting that It proceeds only from the Father."¹⁷ Cerularius adds that the Papal legates were principally against him whom, "or rather the Orthodox Church of God and all those Orthodox who did not subscribe to their blasphemous beliefs and statements, they anathematized because we wanted to keep and advance the Orthodox faith".¹⁸

These were in the main the unfounded accusations contained in the libellum of the Latins, who were convicting and anathematizing the Orthodox because of their adherence to the true faith and tradition of the Church, calling them "Simoniacs, Vaesians, Arians, Donatists, Severians, Nicolaites, Manichaeans, and Nazarenes".¹⁹ Obviously, the libellum of the Latins "contained an ignorant and senseless polemic",²⁰ and it was unjust; grossly ignorant and incorrect was the accusation of Pope Leo and Cardinal Humbert contained therein, that the Greeks had corrupted the sacred Creed, while in reality the exact opposite was true, i.e., that the Latins had forged the Creed by the uncanonical addition of "*filioque*", a term that introduces a completely unknown to both Bible and Tradition new teaching by which the Holy Spirit proceeds "and from the Son".

No impartial critic who would judge this desperate and revolutionary move of the Latins in the light of Church beliefs and contemporary circumstances could but condemn it in its entirety.²¹ This bold and barbarous move of the Latins was, undoubtedly, not only uncanonical but also provocative and insulting against all the members of the Church in Constantinople and the rest of the Empire. And though those people had all the right to retaliate, yet they controlled their indignation and kept themselves to the height of a truly civilized people. K. Paparegopoulos, the great historian, writes on this as follows: "how deeply tolerant and moderate our people were was never shown before than during those critical moments, when even the faintest sign to action on the part of the Patriarch could bring about an awful punishment of the Latins for their crime. Yet the Patriarch allowed that they leave the Church unharmed, and leave

17. Migne, PG, 128,17. Cf. p. 739f.

18. *ibid.*, p. 737,745.

19. *ibid.*, 120, 744-5.

20. K. Amantos, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (in Greek, Athens, 1947), vol. 2, p. 229.

21. V. Congar characterizes this moderately: "bull d' excommunication est un monument d' unimaginable incompréhension." *op. cit.*, p. 77.

also Constantinople safely in two days after they called upon the Emperor and received the customary gifts."²²

Two days after the Papal delegates left, Patriarch Michael Cerularius, in the midst of public indignation and revolt against the unheard-of and impious deed of the Latins, called on July 20, 1054, all the members of the standing Synod which anathematized the Latin libellum thrown on the altar of Haghia Sophia, (a document unholy and abominable thrown by disrespectful and impious people), and those who had written it, as well as those who agreed with it.²³ The Synod, however, did not excommunicate the Pope himself. That was done on purpose so that a door would remain open for reconciliation and reunion. The Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem approved and ratified subsequently the decision of the Synod of Constantinople, and following the example of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, deleted from the Diptychs the Pope's name and severed their communion with him. The four ancient Patriarchates of the East were followed by the Orthodox Church of Russia, so that the entire Eastern Church denounced the Western and vice versa. Since then, for nine whole centuries they stand apart from each other.²⁴

The Latin excommunication had, obviously, originated from one of two sources: directly from Pope Leo IX, according to the Orthodox Synod of July 20, 1054, and according to the confession of the Papal delegation itself, or indirectly from the Papal delegation acting on specific instructions from the Pope and having the right to act freely as the circumstances would require.²⁵ Taking, however, into account that Pope Leo IX had meanwhile died, April 13, 1054, and the Papal throne was vacant on July 16, 1054, the question of the canonical validity of Humbert's excommunication was raised, some believing that such excommunication was null and void,²⁶ others that the excommunication

22. K. Paparegopoulos, *History of the Greek Nation*, (in Greek, Athens, 1887), vol. 4, p. 346-7. Cf. P. Dumont - F. Mercenier - C. Lialine: *Au' est-ce que l' Orthodoxie? Vues catholiques*. Paris, 1945, p. 84-5.

23. Migne, PG, 120,736-48. Mansi, *Concil.* 19, 812-21. C. Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-68.

24. On the contrary V. Congar, having in mind certain cases of communion between the two Churches claims that "ce schisme oriental. commencé avant Cerulair, n' a pas été consommé avec lui et même que, en un sens, il n' a jamais été totalement consommé." *op. cit.*, p. 6.

25. V. Grumel writes that Humbert "brought with him the excommunication decreed by Leo against Cerularius, in the event that he fail to repent; that is, if the Patriarch did not amend, the legates were to proclaim him excommunicated. The text of the documents, which the Cardinal brought with him, clearly confirm this mandate." *op. cit.*, p. 31.

26. P. Kovalevsky, in the collection *Irenikon*, L' Eglise et les Eglises, vol. I, p. 482. Cf. E. Herman, I Legati inviati da Leone IX nel 1054 a Constantinopoli autorizzati a comunicare il patriarca Michele Cerulario?, in *Oriental. Christ. Periodica*, No. 8, (1942), p. 209f.

was canonically valid and in force.²⁷ For it is obvious that "since the Pope had died some months before Cardinal Humbert placed the libellum on the altar of Haghia Sophia, Rome could even question whether Humbert was canonically ordained", as the Roman Catholic theologian V. Congar²⁸ rightly admits. Whatever the case may be, the Roman Catholic Church is guilty beyond doubt, inasmuch as she has approved and since then adhered to the uncanonical and unjust excommunication of her legate Humbert, neither did she deem it her duty to render the excommunication void in a General Synod, as she ought to have done. It is equally unfortunate that even now when nine hundred years have been completed since the day of the Latin excommunication, the Vatican omitted again the gesture that it did not make then, waiting probably for the tenth century of the separation to be completed!

At any rate, the responsibility for the Schism of the year 1054 rests, undoubtedly, with Pope Leo IX and with his legate Cardinal Humbert; they were the ones who attacked and Cerularius had to defend himself and his Church. For it is apparent that the attitude that Cerularius took on this matter "constituted not an attack but a defence against the provocative policies of Leo".²⁹ The Orthodox Synod of July 20, 1054, would never have been convened and never retaliated with its counter-excommunication, had not the Papal excommunication of July 16th preceded. Thus, the Schism was imposed upon Cerularius by Leo IX and especially by his legate Cardinal Humbert, mainly because of their beliefs in regard to the absolute authority of the primacy of the Pope which they sought to impose upon the Orthodox Church, which firmly believed in the ancient system of the Synodical government of the Five Patriarchs. This being the situation, it is not just for the Roman Catholic theologians to speak "about 'the Greek Schism', or 'the Byzantine Schism', or 'the Photian Schism', or 'the Cerularian Schism', but rather about 'the Latin Schism', or 'the Schism of Nicholas', or 'the Schism of Humbert', or 'the Schism of the Roman Church'", which being one of the local Churches of Christendom separated herself from the body of the ancient Catholic Church, "being one only Patriarchate separated herself from the spiritual communion of the remaining four holy Patriarchates, and accepted dogmas and customs foreign to the Orthodox Catholic Church", according to Theodore Balsamon.³⁰

27. A. Michel, *Die Rechtsgültigkeit des römischen Bannes gegen Michael Kerularios*. In "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 42 (1942), 192-205. V. Grumel, *op. cit.*, p. 33f.

28. V. Congar, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

29. Th. Popescu, *Why the Patriarch Michael Cerularius attacked the Latins?*, in "Inaugural of the 25th Anniversary of Chrysostom Papadopoulos", (in Greek, Athens, 1931), pp. 371-3.

30. P. Rallis and M. Potlis Σύνταγμα Ἱερῶν Κανόνων, (in Greek, Athens, 1852), vol. IV, p. 460.

This first and great Schism of the Roman Church has been, undoubtedly, the most tragic event in the history of the ancient Church, and it was unfortunately followed up by another great Schism from within the Roman Church, that of Protestantism of the 16th century, thus finally dividing the one Church into many big and small churches, communions and heresies. Thus, as V. Congar rightly observes, "the split between East and West in the XI century broke the horizontal piece of the Cross of Christ, while the Schism of Protestantism in the XVI century broke the vertical piece on the Cross of Christ, splitting the Church from North to South. It is only logical to believe that this second split would never have happened had the first been averted; and this again could not have happened had the way of thinking of the Orthodox Catholic Church been kept alive in the ecclesiastical life of the West."³¹ So much, then, concerning the division of the one Church of Christ and its real and deeper causes.

III

Now, again, in view of the lamentable division of the Church and the picture it presents as a divided and torn to pieces Christendom, the problem as to the possibility of re-establishing the unity of the Church is seriously discussed. One may say that never before has the subject of ecclesiastical unity been considered in such a serious manner as it is in our days. The nine hundredth anniversary of the Schism has afforded an opportunity to many theologians, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestants, to re-examine the problem of reunion, each from his own theological standpoint. The Second General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which took place at Evanston, Illinois, in August 1954, had the subject included in its agenda under the heading: "Our unity as Christians and our division as Churches". As it was expected, the Council earnestly discussed the problem of reunion, which otherwise is under a constant discussion by the ecumenical ecclesiastical movement. Before concluding this paper, we would like, therefore, to answer from the Orthodox viewpoint the much-discussed question, whether or not the reunion of the divided Christian Churches is completely impossible, especially whether or not a contact and a settlement of the differences between the two Catholic Churches, the Orthodox and the Roman, is completely impossible. Our unhesitating answer is that a settlement of the differences between the Churches is by no means impossible. It must be based, however, on equal terms and be kept unconnected with questions like those

31. *Katholike*, (Roman Catholic newspaper published in Greek, Athens), 5.2. 1954.

of the primacy, infallibility and the rest of the ecclesiological views as well as with the well-known methods of reunion through Uniates, etc.³² It must be based on a serious and unprejudiced study of the differences that separate the two Churches, conducted in the spirit of love, patience and humility, and under the light of the Holy Scripture and the genuine, ancient, sacred Tradition; and that again after a long and successful preparation of the spirits and hearts of the clergy and laity on both sides. We personally believe that the chasm that separates the two Churches is not completely unbridgeable but, on the contrary, it can and must be bridged. Things, which lack of Christian love and the sin of man put apart, especially the love of power and the various personal, ecclesiastical, political, national and economic strivings, Christian love and brotherhood must reunite.

This reunion could not be achieved, however, before the two Churches come in contact with each other and their relationships, broken nine hundred years ago, are re-established. From the Orthodox side such a contact, recognition and ultimately reunion, between the two Catholic Churches cannot be effected but on the ground of the ancient, united Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils and of the eight first centuries; and again, on equal terms and on the condition that both Churches will reject whatever new elements have crept into their faith and practice posterior to the seven General Councils and incongruous with their ancient, common, ecclesiastical tradition.

The Orthodox Church stands willing and ready to do so. The Standing Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate wrote in the year 1895 to Pope Leo XIII as follows: "for the sacred purpose of reunion the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church of Christ is ready and willing to accept wholeheartedly whatever both Churches, the Eastern and Western, before the ninth century were accepting, that perchance we changed or do not possess."³³ The

32. It is about time that the Church of Rome understands that "l'unia apparaît aux Orthodoxes comme étant la caricature et la contradiction même de l'unité", as V. Congar has recently written in *Irenikon*, vol. I, p. 42.

33. Elaborating on this point the Synod wrote to Pope Leo XIII the following: "For the purpose of effecting the much desired union between the two Churches, foremostly one common principle and basis ought to be arranged. Such an undisputable common principle and basis can be no other than the teaching of the Gospel and that of the seven Ecumenical Synods. Going back, accordingly, to this teaching which was common to the Churches of the East and West up to the time of separation, we are compelled to investigate with sincere desire to see the truth plainly, i.e., what the one holy Catholic and Orthodox Apostolic Church of Christ believed then as one body, and to hold this pure and unchanged. Whatever has been added or subtracted in later years must as a sacred duty be corrected, if one desires sincerely the glory of God and not his own, for it must be realized that by arrogantly adhering to the distortion of truth he bears a grave responsibility against the judgment of Christ. We do not mean, however, differences concerning the implements and instruments of ritual which, varying as in the past, do not in the least impair the essence and unity of faith, but we do

Roman Church, as well, must reject whatever Papal innovations she has introduced, posterior to the seven General Councils, in her faith, worship and ecclesiastical government, which are at variance with the decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils and in general with the genuine orthodox tradition and practice of the ancient, united and undivided Church. But above all, both Churches must seek with sincerity, humility and love, their dogmatical and inner union, a complete unity in faith extended over all the fundamental truths of divine Revelation and especially connected with the Head of the Church and her infallibility, with the exception of ritualistic and governmental differences that bear no dogmatic significance. Sixty years ago the Ecumenical Patriarchate made this gesture. It is now up to the Vatican to do the same if it does not want the two-sister Churches, so closely together, to remain in a perpetual state of division for which, in that case, the responsibility will rest with the Roman Church.

This, in our opinion, is the only way by which we can reach an agreement first with the Roman Catholics and then with the Protestants. The Orthodox delegation at Evanston, last August, expressed the same viewpoint to the Protestants: "from the Orthodox viewpoint reunion of Christendom with which the World Council of Churches is concerned can be achieved solely on the basis of the total dogmatic faith of the early undivided Church without either subtraction or alteration. . . Thus, when we are considering the problem of Church unity we cannot envisage it in any other way than as the complete restoration of the total faith and the total episcopal structure of the Church which is

mean those essential differences related with the dogmas of faith divinely given to us and with the divinely instituted organization and government of the Churches. 'There can be no variation in that which is of the faith, nor a fall from the common and universal decree,' as St. Photius says, 'we cannot blame those who keep different customs nor can we say, if we judge rightly, that they who do not keep these commit transgression.' The Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ for the sake of unity is ready and willing to accept whatever she may have changed or does not possess from all that the undivided Church confessed prior to the ninth century. And if the Roman Church can prove on the basis of the teaching of the Fathers and the decrees of the divinely convened Ecumenical Councils that she recited the Creed prior to the ninth century with the addition, or that they used unleavened bread, or that she accepted the teaching of purgatory, sprinkling instead of baptism, the immaculate conception of the ever-Virgin Mary, the secular authority, or the infallible and autocratic claims of the bishops of Rome, then we have nothing to say. If, on the other hand, it be clearly shown, as some truthful Latins admit, that the Eastern and Orthodox Catholic Church of Christ preserves the ancient dogmas, commonly accepted both in the East and West, and that it was the Roman Church that perverted them by various innovations then it is obvious even to an infant that the most natural way towards unity is the return of the Western Church to the ancient system of doctrine and government. For faith never changes with time and conditions, but remains forever and everywhere the same. For, there is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.' (Ephes. 4,5)." Quoted by Karmiris in Greek, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 935-6.

basic to the sacramental life of the Church . . . We believe that the return of the Communions to the faith of the ancient, united and undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils, namely, to the pure and unchanged and common heritage of the forefathers of all divided Christians, shall alone produce the desired reunion of all separated Christians. For, only the unity in the fellowship of Christians in a common faith shall have as a necessary result their fellowship in the sacraments and their indissoluble unity in love, as members of one and the same body of the one Church of Christ . . . We are bound to declare our profound conviction that the holy Orthodox Church alone has preserved in full and intact 'the faith once delivered unto the saints'.³⁴ It is not because of our human merit, but because it pleases God to preserve 'His treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God'.³⁵

This position was taken by the Orthodox delegation, consisting of Greeks, Slavs and Syrians, at the Evanston World Assembly of Christian Churches, and was addressed directly to the Protestants and indirectly to the absent Roman Catholics, who by unethical means such as "Unia" are eager to effect unity. Clarifying our position we would like to state that in speaking about "the return of all Christian Churches and Confessions to the faith of the ancient and undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils" we take this return in a broader sense, i.e. a return to the spirit which was prevailing over and binding together the whole of Christendom. This does not mean that we reject completely all further development and progress in each Church in particular, as long as such development and progress does not conflict with that ancient Christian spirit. This posterior dogmatical and ecclesiastical development, however, should be judged by an Ecumenical Council which shall have the right to approve, alter, improve, or to reject in whole or in part such development and progress. For, in addition to other reasons, our Orthodox Catholic Church cannot accept, e.g., the two recent Latin dogmas concerning the immaculate conception and the assumption of the Virgin Mary for the reason that they were proclaimed solely and without canonical authority by the bishops of Rome whereas this right belongs only to the Ecumenical

34. Jude 3.

35. II Cor., IV,7. On the above C. J. Dumont remarked that, "ces affirmations ont le mérite de la clarté et, sauf la dernière avec laquelle nous ne saurions être pleinement d'accord, elles correspondent très exactement à la doctrine catholique. Il était opportun que nos frères Orthodoxes prissent ainsi clairement position . . . Bien souvent il nous est arrivé de dire que nos frères Orthodoxes défendent, au sein de cette communauté oecuménique, les principes théologiques et ecclésiologiques que nous aurions nous-mêmes à y défendre si nous en faisons partie (à la réserve pres de l'autorité du Pape, naturellement)". *Vers l'unité chrétienne*, in "Bulletin catholique d'information", No. 65-66, Juillet-Octobre 1954, pp. 79,87. See also "Herder-Korrespondenz", 9 (1954) 92: (the Orthodox) "umfangreiche Erklärung machte einem tiefen und niederschlagenden Eindruck auf die Versammlung."

Council whose decisions are made under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. An Ecumenical Council, according to Orthodox teaching, constitutes the authoritative and official voice of the Church, and the means by which her infallibility is expressed. The bearer of this infallibility is found within the whole Church and not in any one of her parts, and more so, not in any one individual though such individual may be a bishop, Patriarch or Pope. It is only the total body of bishops, convened in an Ecumenical Synod and representing the whole Church, that has the right to formulate and proclaim dogmas officially under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, thus expressing the common dogmatical faith and universal consciousness of the infallible Church as seen in the Apostolic Council itself and in the seven Ecumenical Councils which ordained the dogmas of the Roman Church as well. The bishops of Rome, obviously, subjected themselves in all matters to the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the Ecumenical Synods, exactly as St. Peter subjected himself to the authority of the Apostolic Council.³⁶ New dogmas are unacceptable, therefore, by the Orthodox Church unless they are formulated officially and authoritatively by an Ecumenical Council and express the teaching and the spirit of the ancient Church.

From what has been said up to now, it is obvious that there is only one way towards reunion. And that is by reference to the ancient undivided Church, whose indisputable sequence can be found in the Greek Orthodox Church of today as preserving the true spirit, principles and traditions of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. This opinion was also expressed by V. Congar, who, in a lecture at the University of Athens, January last, stressed the need for a mutual and better understanding between the two Churches, Roman Catholic and Orthodox. He is of the opinion that this can be accomplished in two ways: by discussion, on the one hand, and by reference to the sources, on the other. In this way an unprejudiced attitude and the correction of false interpretations will be achieved. For on many occasions we oppose each other because we are unknown to each other; and we do not know each other because we do not communicate and speak to each other. Likewise, we shall be able to come to an understanding by going back to the main sources from which we all draw. Diverse opinions which then will remain, will be differences but not antitheses. We shall both remain, then, true to our Church, just as before, and indeed more so than before. We shall remain, however, true to our Churches in a spirit which shall be foreign to petty jealousies and antagonisms arising from the observance of the letter than of the spirit in an attempt to justify rationally our opposition to each other.³⁷

36. John Karmiris, *The New Dogma of the Roman Church*, in "Ecclesia" (Athens, 1951), 28, 24-25.

37. *Katholike*, 12-2-1954.

We share the opinion of this eminent Roman Catholic theologian with the hope that through discussions with the Orthodox and by return to the common ancient sources, the Roman Catholic Church will decide to change whatever interpolations will be proved to have been made to the common ancient heritage in the passing of time as a result of her estrangement from the Orthodox Church, the continuance of the early and Apostolic Church. The Orthodox Church, in such a case, would have no objection to do likewise by making certain concessions unrelated, of course, with the unalterable Orthodox dogma. For personally I believe that under such presuppositions and conditions our Orthodox Catholic Church would not object to co-operate sincerely with both the Roman Catholic and the other non-Orthodox Churches on the basis of the aforementioned, i.e., by recourse to the unquestionable sources of faith and by means of open discussion. It is hoped that this will lead to a mutual understanding and to an adjustment by "economy" of outstanding differences, and to a restoration of harmony, love and unity, between all the Christians "for whom Christ died", so that the last prayer of our Lord to His Heavenly Father "that all may be one" is fully realized.³⁸

[Translated from the Greek]

38. John, 17,21. Patriarch Photius, much misinterpreted, has this to say: "Christ has bought us back by His own blood from the condemnation of the Old Law; we are all of Christ and we are called His; Christ was crucified for us and suffered death, and was buried, and was raised from the dead so that He may unite those who are divided, having for that purpose established one baptism and one faith, and one Catholic and Apostolic Church. This is the summation of Christ's dwelling amongst men. This is the achievement of that utmost and ineffable self-emptying (kenosis). He who attempts to break or divide this, either for love of impious heresy, or for vain desire to be schismatic, arrays himself against the divine design of Christ, arms himself against the salvation of men, opposes His act, and breaking away from contact with Him, and dividing the Lord's body, i.e., the Church, joins the opposing division, tears to pieces the members of the Church and makes them members of an illicit assembly." Homily 37, in S. Aristarchus, *Addresses and Sermons of our holy Father Photius*, (in Greek, Constantinople, 1900), vol. I, p. 296.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

GREGORY OF NYSSA ON THE NATURE OF THE SOUL¹

John P. Cavarinos
Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

I

For Gregory, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, the problem of the soul is a pivot on which many an important subject is hinged. This preoccupation with the human soul is so prominent in the thought of Gregory, that a special study of his psychology offers a good approach to the teaching or *paideia* of this church doctor.

In the field of systematic psychology there was a wide gap separating Gregory's time from antiquity. Or better still, the Church had not as yet undertaken to develop a systematic psychology of its own. The Cappadocian father felt the need for filling in this gap. Christianity, being concerned above all with man's destiny and salvation, must inevitably undertake to explain the mystery of life; and for the Christian that means more specifically the human soul: its nature, origin, destiny; the relation of the soul to the body and to God, etc. Though a central Christian problem, the study of the soul had not been taken up by the fathers of the Church in as comprehensive a manner as the subject merited. That was essentially the task of Gregory of Nyssa.

That such an important matter should have been delayed so long can best be explained by the difficulty of its nature. It is a subject that involves a great deal of investigation in diverse fields—theology, philosophy, medicine. Practical experience and keen observation are also essential, besides the possession of an

1. This article is a portion of my Ph.D. dissertation that was submitted to the Faculty of Harvard University in 1947. The first part of the article shall serve as a general introduction both to this article and the others that will follow on the psychology of Gregory of Nyssa.

analytical and synthetic mind. Gregory combines in himself the streams of knowledge necessary for a comprehensive treatment of the problem. He is well versed not only in Christian and pagan theology, but also in the philosophies of classical Greece and of his own time. In contrast to the other two Cappadocians, his brother Saint Basil, who was more interested in the institution and training of the church, and Gregory of Nazianzus with his strong rhetorical and theological tendencies, Gregory of Nyssa had a decidedly strong philosophical bent. Gregory was perhaps better versed in heathen philosophy than any other church writer of the fourth century.²

On various occasions Gregory showed his appreciation for the Ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία for its wealth and value,³ without at the same time being quite free from that bias which is characteristic of the early church. However, notwithstanding some unfavorable comments⁴ Gregory made on pagan learning, he believed that, to use one of his statements, τὴν τε γὰρ ἠθικὴν καὶ φυσικὴν φιλοσοφίαν, γεωμετρίαν τε καὶ ἀστρονομίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν πραγματείαν καὶ πάντα ὅσα παρὰ τοῖς ἔξω τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σπουδάζεται are very useful and desirable ὅταν δέη τὸν θεῖον τοῦ μυστηρίου ναὸν διὰ τοῦ λογικοῦ πλούτου καλλωπισθῆναι.⁵ His entire work, above all his psychology, bears this out.

Besides his susceptibility to the masters of antiquity for many a concept in the field of metaphysics and speculation, Gregory also comes under the influence of the Hellenic ideal of the good and the beautiful. Armin Reiche, in a dissertation under the title of *Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt-und Lebens-Anschauung des Gregor von Nyssa*, dwells at length on this important influence on Gregory, pointing out the latter's originality and peculiarity in this respect in contrast to the other church fathers. "Seine Verdienste liegen nicht nur auf dem Felde der reinen Spekulation, sondern er besitzt auch einen für alles Gute und Schöne höchst empfänglichen Sinn. In der Verbindung dieser Momente liegt das Eigentümliche Gregors gegenüber allen anderen Kirchenvätern."⁶ Here, as in many other instances, Gregory's dependence on Plato is observed: "In seinen Bestimmungen über das Schöne schliesst sich Gregor von Nyssa grösstenteils den Ausführungen Platos an."⁷

2. Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur*, vol. III, p. 192.

3. A passage in the *Life of Moses* (PG, XLIV, 360B-C) bears Gregory's strongest praise for pagan learning. Cf. PG, XLIV, 336Dff.; PG, XLVI, 901A-B.

4. PG, XLIV, 329B is an extreme case.

5. PG, XLIV, 360B-C.

6. Armin Reiche, *op. cit.* (Jena, 1897), p. 7.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 9

For an objective treatment of the soul, the physical nature of man, and of the universe, Gregory is compelled to go back to tradition: to study the psychology and theories on the universe of classical Greece and of the Hellenistic period; to go to the writers of medical literature for a comprehensive view of the physical nature of man and medicine in general; to pay attention to contemporary heathen philosophy.

Of all philosophers of antiquity, Plato was the thinker who impressed Gregory the most. In this respect Gregory may well be regarded the climax of that dominating interest in Platonism of the church fathers from Justin Martyr down to his own time. Towards the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, a change is sensed. A definite interest in Aristotle is felt in the work of Nemesius,⁸ an interest which becomes more and more a preference with writers like Leontius of Byzantium and John of Damascus as time goes on.

Plato influenced our author to such a degree, that on various occasions some students of Gregory⁹ have undertaken comparative studies to prove Gregory's dependence on and even imitation of Plato. However, although it is true that Gregory has been influenced to a great extent by Plato both in thought and style,¹⁰ it should not thereby be inferred that the Christian doctor was a mere imitator of the classical philosopher. Our study will endeavor to indicate at the appropriate places the essential points of contact between the two men, as well as the uniqueness of Gregory. This will prove that Gregory was not only an admirer of Platonic thought, but also a Christian father who did his best to make good use of classical and contemporary material for giving form and expression to accepted Christian doctrines and concepts. He endeavored to give to the entire system of church doctrines, to the greatest degree possible at the time, what rational foundations heathen philosophy (ἡ ἔξω σοφία) could provide, without, at the same time, doing violence to faith.¹¹

In a word, Gregory was a Hellene "par excellence" in that he gave new meaning to old concepts. He saw a permanent value in the classical paideia, and in his thought he strove to make

8. Cf. Domanski, *Die Psychologie des Nemesios* (Münster, 1900), xv-xvi.

9. A. M. Akylas, *Plato's Opinion concerning the Immortality of the Soul compared to that of Gregory of Nyssa* (Athens, 1888); H. F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa* (Class. Phil. XI, 1930-33; Univ. of Calif.); Karl Gronau, *De Basilio, Gregorio Nazianzeno Nyssenoque Platonis Imitatoribus* (Gottingen, 1908)

10. In the matter of style the second sophistic movement is of special consequence for the Cappadocian. See Méridier, *L'Influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'oeuvre de Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris, 1906)

11. Cf. F. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Zweiter Teil (1929), p. 84: "Niemand vor Gregor hat die rationale Begründung des Glaubens in so umfassender Weise durchzuführen gesucht."

good use of it by choosing and appropriating for himself whatever portions of it seemed to him to possess the essential qualities of reason, beauty, and form.

Ninety-seven years ago a German scholar, Stigler,¹² dealt with the psychology of Gregory. Unfortunately we have not been able to avail ourselves of this work. However, on the testimony of B. Domanski,¹³ this treatise was defective in that Stigler used as source material the "libelli de anima", a portion of Nemesius' work (chapters II and III of *De Natura Hominis*) falsely assigned to Gregory of Nyssa in some of our manuscripts and still to be found in the Migne edition of the works of Gregory.¹⁴

Stigler's treatise is further unfavorably criticized by Franz Diekamp¹⁵ for having used the unauthentic work *De eo quid sit, Ad imaginem*, etc., falsely attributed to Gregory. We may add that the portions of this spurious work concerned with the soul, where the trinitarian doctrine of the Godhead in type takes the place of the classical tripartite division of the soul, are far from being in harmony with the rest of Gregory's writings.¹⁶

Of the works of Gregory which serve as the chief sources for our material on the subject of psychology, the dialogue entitled *On the Soul and the Resurrection* can be considered as the most important one. This work, a dialogue between Gregory himself and his sister Macrina, was modeled on Plato's *Phaedo* and shows quite clearly the debt our author owes to Plato for his literary form, besides the borrowing of ideas.¹⁷ Two other very important works are the *Catechetical Oration* and *On the Making of Man*. Other pertinent works are: *On Virginity*, *On Perfection*, *On the Life of Moses or concerning Perfection according to Virtue*, *Canonical Epistle, To the Sayings of Scripture: Let us create Man in our Image and Likeness*, *On the Dead*, *Against Eunomius*, *Concerning the Children that die prematurely*.

12. *Die Psychologie des hl. Gregor von Nyssa* (Regensburg, 1857).

13. *Op. cit.*, xi-xii.

14. *Ibid.*, xii: "In Verkennung oder Unkenntniss dieser Thatsache [the unauthenticity of the 'libelli de anima'] hat Stigler in diesen beiden Kapiteln die Lehre des hl. Gregor zu finden vermeint. Durch das Streben nun, einen Einklang in die Lehre Gregors über das Entstehen der Seele zu bringen hat sich Stigler zu einer ganz eigenthümlichen und unbegreiflichen Missdeutung einer nemesianischen Stelle (s. Stigler S. 78F.) verleiten lassen. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44, where Domanski accuses Stigler of erroneous interpretations and mistranslations of passages.

15. Franz Diekamp, *Die Gotteslehre des Heiligen Gregor von Nyssa* (Monasterii Guestf., 1895), p. 67, footnote.

16. Franz Preger, *Die Grundlagen der Ethik bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Würzburg, 1897), pp. 21-22, quotes this work (PG, XLIV, 1328B) in discussing the nature of man in the thought of Gregory.

17. See Akylas, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-11

II

Our study of the nature of the soul in the thought of Gregory will avoid as much as possible the time- and space-consuming discussion on the sources of our author. Akylas, Cherniss, Gronau, and others have already made important contributions to this end. Their conclusions form an important foundation for subsequent studies on the psychology of the Cappadocian father. Akylas in his *Plato's Opinion concerning the Immortality of the Soul compared to that of Gregory of Nyssa* points out with parallel passages the influence of Plato's psychology on that of Gregory. It is shown, in fact, that Plato's *Phaedo* served as a model for the church father's treatise, *On the Soul and the Resurrection*.¹⁸ Another scholar, K. Gronau, though establishing Gregory as an imitator of Plato in his *De Basilio, Gregorio Nazianzeno Nyssenoque Platonis Imitatoribus*,¹⁹ attempted unsuccessfully to prove in another work, *Poseidonios und die Jüdisch-Christliche Genesisexegese*,²⁰ the indebtedness of Gregory to Posidonius the Stoic.²¹

For Gregory, as for the ancients, the science of the soul has two great divisions, the metaphysical and the psychological proper. The first is concerned with the nature or essence of the soul, its origin, and destiny. The latter division is primarily concerned in determining, defining, and classifying the diverse faculties of the soul.

The study of the nature of the soul in the work of Gregory of Nyssa is essentially a metaphysical one, inasmuch as it endeavors to comprehend the essence of an immaterial entity. In his conception of the human soul, Gregory makes a sharp and clear-cut distinction between the soul on the one hand, and the body on the other; the first being spiritual and incorporeal, and the latter material and corporeal. The soul is in and by itself peculiar and distinct from the corporeal coarseness.²² It is called the cause of life (τὸ ζωτικὸν αἷτιον, ζωοποιὸν αἷτιον);²³ while the body is termed a compound (σύγκριμα) or concourse of elements (συνδρομή τῶν στοιχείων).²⁴ The soul, then, is the principle that gives life to the body. It is from this very principle of life and activity that the existence of the soul in the body is made known to us. Heat, energy, and motion give evidence of life. On the other hand,

18. Cf. notes 9 and 17.

19. See note 9.

20. (Teubner, 1914), chapters II-IV.

21. See R. M. Jones' review of the second work in *Class. Phil.* XII, Jan., 1917.

22. PG, XLVI, 28C: αὐτὴν καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐν ἐξηλλαγμένη τε καὶ ἰδιαζούσῃ φύσει, παρὰ τὴν σωματικὴν παχυμέρειαν.

23. PG, XLVI, 16B; 17B.

24. *Ibid.*, 24B.

the lack of heat and motion is an indication of death.²⁵ This definition of the soul as a life-giving principle is in accord with that of Plato. In *Cratylus*, where the origin of the word "soul" is considered, the soul is called the cause of life for the body.²⁶ Then the absence of the soul is the cause of death.²⁷

In a precise résumé form, the nature of the soul is defined as οὐσία γεννητή, οὐσία ζῶσα, νοερά, σώματι ὁργανικῶ καὶ αἰσθητικῶ, δύναμιν ζωτικὴν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀντιληπτικὴν δι' ἑαυτῆς ἐνιούσα, ἕως ἂν ἡ δεκτικὴ τούτων συνέστηκε φύσις.²⁸ Here we shall confine ourselves to the essence of the soul and take up in subsequent articles the origin of the soul, its relation to the body, its faculties.

Gregory, like Plato, desirous of stressing the immortality of the soul by pointing out its simple and uncompounded nature, insists strongly on the indivisibility of the soul.²⁹ Though he at times may speak of parts of the soul in discussing its activity in connection with the body, he hastens on appropriate occasions to state that one should not be led to believe that in man the soul is divided into parts or that man consists of a compound of many souls. "The real and perfect soul (τελεία ψυχή) is one in nature, the spiritual and immaterial, which mingles with the material nature through the senses".³⁰

The soul proper is the rational faculty: κυρίως ψυχή, ἡ λογική καὶ ἔστι καὶ λέγεται· αἱ δ' ἄλλαι ὁμωνύμως κατονομάζονται.³¹ And, moreover, in its association with irrational faculties, the rational faculty suffers no change in its essential nature: τὸ δὲ διανοητικὸν τε καὶ λογικὸν ἄμικτόν ἐστι ἰδιάζον.³² The rational and spiritual faculty is the ruling principle (προτερεύει τὸ νοερόν), and whatever irrational element is encrusted on the soul proper is simply the product

25. PG. XLIV, 237A. Cf. *Ibid.*, 236D: 'Ἡ δὲ νεκρότης κατὰ στέρησιν ψυχῆς γίνεται. *Ibid.*, XLVI, 29A-B: 'Ἡ γὰρ ὁργανικὴ τοῦ σώματος αὕτη διασκευή . . . ἀκίνητος μένει καὶ ἀνενέργητος, τῆς ψυχικῆς δυνάμεως ἐν αὐτῇ μὴ οὐσης.

26. *Crat.*, 399d-e: . . . ὅταν παρῇ τῷ σώματι, αἰτιὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ ζῆν αὐτῷ . . . Cf. *Phaedo*, 105c-d.

27. *Crat.* 399e. *Phaedo*, 105d. *Phaedrus*, 245c-246a. *Laws*, 893b-896d. Cf. Aristotle, *De Anima*, I, 5, 411b. Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, 38 (ed. Mat.).

28. PG, XLVI, 29B. Cf. Aristotle, *De Anima*, II, 1, 412b, where the soul is defined as "the first grade of actuality of a natural organized body" (σώματος φυσικοῦ ὁργανικοῦ).

29. In *Phaedo*, 78b-80b, Plato says that the soul is divine and therefore indivisible. Now only the composite is liable to dissolution. But the soul, being indivisible or incomposite, must be indissoluble.

30. PG, XLIV, 176B.

31. *Ibid.*, 176C

32. PG, XLVI, 60B.

and result of the soul's association and connection with the body.³³ Therefore, everything irrational connected with the soul is not part of the soul itself, but a vital activity (ἐνέργεια ζωτική) essential to the existence of man in this world; for "neither do the senses exist without a material substance, nor the rational faculty without the senses".³⁴

With arguments similar to those of Plato,³⁵ Gregory contends that the passions and desires are distinct from the soul and cannot be considered parts of the soul.³⁶ . . . ταῦτα [sc. πάθη] ἔξωθεν ἐπιγενέσθαι αὐτῇ λογιζόμεθα, διὰ τὸ τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ κάλλει μηδένα τοιοῦτον ἐνδεωρηθῆναι χαρακτηῖρα.³⁷ Gregory supports his point here with the argument that the passions have no resemblance to the archetypal beauty, God. Moreover, states Gregory, the spiritual and inseparable nature (ἀδιάστατος φύσις) does not permit the changes which result from disintegration and separation.³⁸

For Gregory, far from having any affinity with the divine nature, the passions and irrational impulses are animal traits: anger is a canine quality; greed pertains to the wolf, etc.³⁹ Indeed, according to the Cappadocian, these irrational impulses constitute in man so many beasts which must be mastered if man is to enjoy an inner harmony.⁴⁰

Now despite his repeated affirmation that the soul is an indivisible entity, Gregory does not find it inconsistent to speak of a tripartite division of the soul in the classical sense: τὸ λογι-

33. PG, XLIV, 181C. Cf. Plato, *Politicus*, 309c: There is the eternally existing part of the human soul (τὸ αἰγενές ὃν τῆς ψυχῆς) and the part which comes into existence with the animal existence (τὸ ζογενές). In *Timaeus* 41a-42e, the Demiurge created the immortal, rational part of the soul. The mortal part of the soul (τὸ θνητὸν τῆς ψυχῆς εἶδος) was created by the young Gods who created the bodies for the souls and at the same time the mortal part of the soul (θυμός, ἐπιθυμία).

34. PG, XLIV, 176B: Οὔτε οὖν αἰσθησις χωρὶς ὕλικῆς οὐσίας, οὔτε τῆς νοεράς δυνάμεως χωρὶς αἰσθήσεως ἐνέργεια γίνεται. In *Phaedrus*, 246-257, the disembodied soul is represented as having as integral parts of it those which in *Timaeus* (41a-42e) are said to constitute the mortal parts of the soul. Cf. R. Demos, *The Philosophy of Plato*, p. 305: "It would seem that the junction of the immortal with the mortal soul is indissoluble."

35. *Republic*, 611D: The Glaucus simile illustrates how the soul is marred by its contact with foreign matter and the earthly accretions about the soul resulting from its association with the body.

36. PG, XLVI, 56A. Cf. Plato, *Phaedo*, 66c; *Cratylus*, 404a.

37. PG, XLVI, 57C. Cf. *Ibid.*, 56C: "Ἄ πάντα καὶ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐστὶ καὶ ψυχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλ' ὅλον μυρμηκία τινὲς τοῦ διανοητικοῦ μέρους τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκφυόμεναι. Ἄ μέρη μὲν αὐτῆς εἶναι διὰ τὸ προσπεφυκέναι νομίζεται, οὐ μὴν ἐκείνῳ εἶσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ κατ' οὐσίαν.

38. *Ibid.*, 48A-B.

39. *Ibid.*, XLIV, 276ff.; XLVI, 56.

40. *Ibid.*, XLIV, 277A-C.

στικόν, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, τὸ θυμοειδές.⁴¹ With respect to the use of the classical partition of the soul, Gregory is not less consistent than Plato. Both agree that the soul proper is indivisible and uncompounded, and both take this condition as a strong argument to prove that the soul is immortal.⁴²

On the other hand, the division that both accept and discuss frequently as if the soul itself were really composed of distinct parts is one that is based on the realization of the fact that after all the soul in man exists in association with a material body, and that the material accretions about the soul as μεθόρια can be referred to the soul in dealing with its activity in the human body.⁴³

Here it must be stated that the Cappadocian father is inconsistent when he accepts Plato's division of the soul in so far as it explains certain phenomena in dealing with man as an earthly being, and then rejects this very division allegedly on the ground that it does not harmonize with the Scriptures where man is considered the image of God.⁴⁴

Gregory places his greatest reliance for proving that the soul is one and indivisible, and hence immortal, on the Scriptural affirmation that man was made in the image and likeness of God.⁴⁵ He devotes an entire treatise (*To the Sayings of Scripture: Let us make Man in Our Image and Likeness*) to dwell on this subject. The likeness of man to God consists in his possession of reason, for τὸ ἀρχικόν . . . ἐν τῇ τοῦ λογισμοῦ περιουσίᾳ.⁴⁶ Therefore, "let us make man in our image" means let us give him λόγου περιουσίαν. The passions and desires are excluded, since they can have no place in an image of God.⁴⁷ Man possesses within him the divine beauty (θεῖον κάλλος) in the form of νοῦς καὶ λόγος.⁴⁸ It is seen then, that for Gregory man resembles God in so far as he possesses an independent governing principle, namely reason, which in reality is

41. *Ibid.*, XLIV, 144D; 361C-D; 353C. XLV, 224C; 224A-B: Τρία ἐστὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν θεωρούμενα κατὰ τὴν πρώτην διαίρεσιν . . .

42. Plato, *Phaedo*, 78c: Οὐκοῦν ἄπερ αἰεὶ κατὰ ταῦτα καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχει, ταῦτα μάλιστα εἰκὸς εἶναι τὰ ἀσύνθετα. Cf. *Ibid.*, 80b. *Timaeus*, 41c-d.

43. PG, XLVI, 57C: "Ὅσα δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν μεθορίῳ κείται πρὸς ἐκάτερον τῶν ἐναντίων ἐπιρροεῖς κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν ἔχοντα· ὧν ἡ ποῖα χρήσις, ἡ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον ἄγει τὴν ἐκβάσιν . . . ὧν ἄνευ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρωπίνην θεωρηθῆναι φύσιν. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 70d-e.

44. PG, XLVI, 49C-52A: Οὐκοῦν παρέντες τὸ Πλατωνικὸν ἄγμα . . . σκοπὸν τοῦ λόγου τὴν θεόπνευστον Γραφὴν ποιησώμεθα, ἡ ψυχῆς ἐξαιρέτον μηδὲν νομίζειν εἶναι νομοθετεῖ, ὃ μὴ καὶ τῆς θείας φύσεώς ἐστιν ἴδιον. Cf. Cherniss, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 12ff. This inconsistency of Gregory is clearly pointed out.

45. See Plato's arguments of the soul's likeness to the divine ideas and gods in *Phaedo*, 78b-84b.

46. PG, XLIV, 264A.

47. *Ibid.*, 268D: "Ἀνθρώπος ἐστὶ ποίημα Θεοῦ λογικόν, κατ' εἰκόνα γινόμενον τοῦ κτίσαντος.

48. *Ibid.*, 137B.

the soul proper. Thus the spiritual and rational faculty of the soul, νοῦς, becomes the ruling principle, and alone comes to be called soul; everything else connected with this faculty is termed an ἐνέργεια ζωτική.⁴⁹

49. *Ibid.*, 176D-177A.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ARNOLD TOYNBEE, *An Historian's Approach to Religion*. London: Oxford University Press, 1956. Pp. 318.

To the Orthodox reader it is significant that Toynbee in the beginning of this book re-affirms what we find ambiguously stated in *A Study of History*: "The attempt to revive the Roman Empire had been a fiasco in Western Christendom, whereas it had been a success in Eastern Orthodox Christendom." He would have been closer to the truth if he had spoken of an attempt to continue the Roman Empire, instead of "reviving" it, since there is no break in its continuity in the East. But Toynbee is overanxious to find parallelisms at the expense of accuracy.

The author describes the breakdown of the unified Papal State as the "most tragic of all disasters that the Western Society has brought upon itself so far." The meaning of such a statement can especially be appreciated by an Orthodox reader. The unity of Europe under the Papacy was precarious from the beginning because of tensions within its very structure which could never bring lasting contentment to the human spirit. It would have been truer to say "the most tragic of all disasters" was the estrangement of the Roman See from Eastern Christianity which provided the framework of the Orthodox Christian Society. The history of Western Society is the story of the attempt to restore what was lost with the breakdown of the Roman Empire in the West under the barbarian invasions.

Toynbee's new book is evidence that England is a permanent home of deism which emerged in that country 300 years ago. He speaks to us in that same tradition established by Lord Herbert of Cherbury and proves that deistic philosophy is still very much a part of British thought. In much the same way that it echoed throughout the continent in the seventeenth century in the works of its early proponents, and spread under new forms to other countries, it once again resounds to the entire Western world. The irony of the matter is that Toynbee offers a solution to the crisis of Western Society in a deistic fashion, whereas deism itself has played such a major part in producing the crisis.

Since the rise of deism, England has given birth to thinkers who have brought nothing but ruin upon the cause of the Christian Faith by their radical and disruptive thinking. Toynbee's name can be added to the imposing array of British writers who have had a negative effect on traditional Christianity such as Bacon, Locke, Hume, Herbert, Hobbes, Toland, Hartley, Priestly, Bertrand Russell. Though Toynbee is not a materialist as some of his predecessors were, his deistic beliefs make him equally baneful of Christianity in its conservative, historical form. Deism in earlier times inaugurated the period of free thinking which has been known as the "enlightenment" and which spread the

seeds of cultural disunity and confusion. Toynbee's religion is a deistic version of Christianity which can only intensify the chaos of Western culture. An amalgamation of world religions, which he advocates, is a fanciful notion far exceeding the limits of human conception. The concept of the bringing together of religions has always produced friction and conflict, not compromises and concessions. Today it will produce at least an increase of intransigence. It is imaginary to contend that some sort of super-religion will be attained on the basis of a general agreement among religions. The world religions will always lay claims to finality and exclusiveness, not because of any self-centeredness caused by original sin, as Toynbee would have us believe, but because it is of the very nature of religion to claim finality. It is of the very essence of Christianity to be exclusive, since its Founder revealed that He has disclosed the fullness of truth to man. Toynbee's criticism of Christianity as being self-centered and in need of repentance is pernicious. It indicates either a gross misunderstanding of the Christian religion, or an ill-conceived attempt to distort the Christian message.

In the chapter "Idolization of Religious Institutions," Christ is treated as one among many founders of religion, and the Church is mentioned as an example of the corruption of religion. In keeping faithful to his "branch theory" of religion, Toynbee looks at Christianity merely as one of the Judaistic religions along with Islam. Thus, adherents to Christianity, with its traditional claims to uniqueness, implicitly are guilty of "megalomania," and all talk of special covenants with God and all notions of select people of God are "preposterous." Here it is easy to see that the writer is walking in the footsteps of his deist predecessors. The absolute claims of Christianity cannot be valid because "the first test of the valid claim, if there were a valid one, might be expected to be that it should win a universal recognition and acceptance from mankind." But such a contention involves Toynbee in an inconsistency. If original sin is a reality, as he appears to acknowledge in a later chapter, then we cannot expect truths and valid claims that go along with truths to be universally accepted. It is true that all religions share somewhat in the Truth, but this does not necessarily mean that one religion cannot be the repository of the fullness of Truth.

But we cannot altogether hold Toynbee responsible for the misrepresentation of the facts, suffice it to remember that he has never known true, unadulterated Christianity. He is the child of an infirm, secularized civilization, which sprang from a distorted Christianity, and this accounts for the falsity of his therapeutical efforts. Western Papal Christendom again is responsible for such men as Toynbee. Perhaps a member of another European civilization and religion may have a bet-

ter standpoint from which to make more reliable judgments and evaluations. It is obvious that I am referring to the Orthodox Christian Society, which Toynbee ignores in his appraisal of the Christian religion. In his attempt to discredit Christianity and to level it off with other higher religions, he omits any mention of Orthodoxy.

It is probably more British deism rather than Ritchlianism that makes the writer say that the Christian Gospel must be stripped of its "incongruous and outworn Greek scientific dress." Orthodoxy has long been accustomed to hearing such indictments against its Christian Hellenic heritage. Theologians have long since advocated the "dehellenizing" of Christianity, and it should not surprise us that a man like Toynbee should make such a proposal. That the "intellectual processing took the life out" of the Christian Faith is an outworn belief and completely unfounded in the light of Orthodox history. It should be remembered that the synthesis of Christianity and Hellenism in Orthodoxy accounts for the spiritual and intellectual stability and organic unity of the Orthodox Christian Society.

Toynbee maintains that when God was deposed from His heavenly throne in the seventeenth century by Western man, there was no vestige of the divine left in finite existence. There is much truth to the statement that "Christianity had taken the traditional divinity out of non-human nature in its zeal for the faith that there was no god but God and that Nature was nothing but God's creature." This is a remarkable insight, because it is so often forgotten that Latin Christianity represented a divine transcendentalism. God was a far-off reality approached only through the medium of an authoritarian hierarchy, which took the place of the absent Christ. This is one of the consequences of the West's departure from Eastern Christianity: the loss of the sense of divine immanence and the continuity between the natural and supernatural which remains a permanent trait of Orthodox thought.

Toynbee's analysis of the underlying causes of the crisis of modern man deserves the serious attention of all who are earnestly concerned with the question of permanent peace in an atomic age of unprecedented threats. His interrelation and parallelism of events are masterly. The disillusionment of Western man and his sin of "self-assurance" are themes handled in a way becoming to a prophetic writer. Toynbee is keenly aware of the fact that Western Society is suffering from the sin of over self-confidence, and as it extends its bounds it draws much of the rest of the world into the misery and anxieties which have become inherent in it. The cultures which it claims to civilize are being tragically led to the verge of disaster which overhangs the Western world. Other civilizations are accepting Western culture at the high cost of

receiving the risks that go with it. With supreme self-reliance the man of the late Modern Western Civilization continues to look down upon the "original version of his own" civilization as being "medieval" and all other contemporary societies as "semi-civilized." It makes one wonder in which category the Orthodox Christian Society should belong, since Eastern Orthodox Christianity is the religious framework of a distinct culture.

Certainly, Toynbee's voice is an important one in giving a prophetic expression to the spiritual bankruptcy of Western Society. He sounds the warning to an age facing global disaster. This much credit we must give him. He affirms that Western Society cannot live by bread alone, as it has tried to do so for the past three centuries. His analysis and insight into the interpretation of events are ingenious, and his demonstration of the tragedy of the history of Western man is superbly performed. Yet, he is a product of the very culture he wishes to diagnose, and hampered as he is by the infirmities and limitations of that culture, he has proposed a religion which, instead of effecting a cure, will perpetuate the crisis of the West, unless, of course, global destruction brings a quick end to it.

THE VERY REV. EUSEBIUS A. STEPHANOU

PETER HAMMOND, *The Waters of Marah: The Present State of the Greek Church*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956. Pp. 186.

This book is quite different from previous ones written on the subject, for it not only demonstrates a considerable understanding of the Greeks and their Orthodox faith in its various aspects — be these dogmatic, mystical, or ritual — but also it is written without the prejudice and bias that have characterized some of the works of Western writers that have appeared in the past, especially during the centuries of the subjugation of Hellas by the Turkish oppressors. In contrast to some of his earlier predecessors, the author of this work shows a sympathetic attitude toward the Greeks who underwent dreadful trials and persecutions during World War II and its aftermath; and he is full of admiration for the vigorous qualities of the Greek Church and people displayed in the rebuilding of schools, churches, and whole villages, as well as sustaining the religious and ethnic morale of the nation shattered by a disastrous war and a communistic revolution.

The Waters of Marah, of course, is not a systematic and thorough study of the subject, and as the author himself states, "I have set out to

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

AN IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION ON THE SCHISM

[The nine hundredth anniversary of the Schism between East and West (1054-1954), prompted an important correspondence between Bishop Athenagoras, of the 4th Episcopal District of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and Cardinal Francis McIntyre, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles. The second letter of Bishop Athenagoras to Cardinal McIntyre touches upon some very important points relating to the causes and nature of the Schism. Trusting that this letter will prove of interest to our readers we publish it below in its entirety. Since this letter was written, Bishop Athenagoras has become bishop of the 3rd Episcopal District with headquarters in Boston. Ed.]

Your Eminence,

It was with great joy indeed that I received your esteemed letters, that of last June 20th and of July 9th. I wish to thank Your Eminence for them and for the enclosed booklets which I read with sincere interest, though their contents were known to me from my previous studies and through other sources.

In the introduction of your second letter, Your Eminence states very appropriately, that you share with us the sorrow in observing the occasion of the completion of nine centuries of the Schism and that the Orthodox Church in steadfastness continues to keep the Faith of the Apostles "amidst the greatest of difficulties".

Because of the fact that in Your second letter there are views expressed which need historical and theological clarification, I dare, in the following lines, to draw Your attention upon the following facts. I hope that through them Your Eminence will recognize more clearly some proofs of the steadfastness of the Orthodox Catholic Church to the Faith of the Apostles and the retaining of the sacred traditions of the undivided Church. It is also desired that you may view the Schism and the past failures to bridge this chasm from another historical viewpoint.

First, concerning the name of the Schism. In Your letter, sharing the views of Roman Catholic historians, Your Eminence predicates the Schism as "the Schism of the East." Your Eminence knows, we Orthodox refer to it as "the Schism of the

West." The geographical localization from both sides does not change its basic character, neither does it lessen the extent of responsibility. History has recorded its etiology in the failures of Christ's followers. The act of excommunication issued by the Papal delegates, July 16, 1054, against the Patriarch of Constantinople was surely a failure, signaling the absence of Christian love. St. Peter, however, did not take such a step in the case of his disagreement with St. Paul. Their disagreement is not an obscure Scriptural fact but is well known to us all. According to the New Testament St. Peter stood "condemned" among the members of the Christian Community (Gal. 2:11). St. Paul reprimanded St. Peter for his hypocritical attitude as "not walking uprightly to the truth of the Gospel." In view of this refutation St. Peter did not dare to deny St. Paul's Apostolicity nor cut him from the body of the Christian Community. But after eleven centuries of Christian experience, in martyrdom, in persecutions, in triumphs, Rome, exercising authority in the name of St. Peter, attempted to cut off from the Christian Community a Patriarch, because he had the courage to refute Rome's arbitrariness in not keeping the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and in not walking uprightly in Faith.

On the basis of this uncontested historical testimony, the Christian East replied to the Christian West with a counter act of excommunication, and until today considers its contention in calling the Schism "Western", completely justified. One may say, that the Schism mainly thrived upon the egotistical attitude, the struggle for preeminence, which was condemned by our Lord, that entered and dominated the hearts and minds of some responsible leaders of the Western Church. They, in complete disregard of Christ's admonitions for humility, tried to prove their superior position in the Church by presenting and interpreting Biblical testimony in a way unknown to Apostolic Tradition. (See the Pamphlet: "The Schism", by Archbishop Michael.)

For example, in the mind of the Apostles, no one was considered infallible or superior, save Jesus Christ. In the Apostolic Synod, the presiding officer was not St. Peter but St. James (See Acts, Chapter 15). St. Peter, by the order of the Apostles, went to Samaria to strengthen the members of the Christian Community there (Acts, 8:14). St. Paul without hesitation whatsoever says to St. Peter himself and his followers:

"When I saw that they were not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel I said to Cephas (Peter) before them all: If though a Jew, thou livest like the Gentiles, and not like the Jews, how is it that thou dost compel the Gentiles to live like the Jews?" (Gal. 2:14)

According to church history, St. Peter became the first Bishop of Antioch. Testimony to this fact comes to us from the East and the West. We learn of this from St. John Chrysostom, St.

Jerome, Pope St. Gregory I, and many others. The prevalent historical position is that the great Apostles were not the founders of the Church of Rome, for when they visited Rome the Church there was already in existence. Although St. Paul ordained Linus as the first Bishop of Rome before His martyrdom, we cannot deny the fact that both the great Apostles exercised Episcopal duties in the great city. The very presence of an Apostle in a Christian Community bespeaks of a recognized position of spiritual authority. Thus, every city and all countries were to be within the Apostle's sphere of authority. Both the great Apostles when in Rome were Bishops. However, the fact that St. Paul was given the charge to enlighten the peoples of the gentile Nations may unhesitatingly lead one to accept him as the ruling Bishop of the city of Rome. Pope St. Gregory I offers testimony to the fact that St. Peter glorified Rome, one of his three Sees, with martyrdom. In a letter to Bishop Eulogius of Alexandria he says:

"Your Holiness has spoken to me at large, in your letters of the See of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, saying that he still resides here by his successors. Now, I acknowledge myself unworthy not only of the honour of the chiefs, but even to be counted in the number of the faithful. Yet I have willingly accepted all you have said, because your words regarding the See of St. Peter came from him who occupies that See of St. Peter . . . But I greatly rejoice that you, who are very holy, only ascribe to me what you also give to yourself . . . Therefore though there were many Apostles, the single See of the prince of the Apostles prevailed by his Princedom: which See now exists in three places; for it is he that made glorious that See where he condescended to rest (quiscere) and close his present life. It is he who strengthened the See which he occupied for seven years although finally compelled to leave it. Since then there is but one See of the same Apostle, and three Bishops now hold it by divine authority. All the good that I hear of you I also impute to myself." (Letters of St. Gregory, Book VIII, Ep. 2)

The same Pope writes to Anastasios, Bishop of Antioch:

"Behold now, your Holiness is weighed down with many tribulations in your old age, but remember what was said of him whose seat you fill. It is not of him that the Truth himself said: 'When thou shalt be old . . . another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not' . . . As we have in common the master, the Prince of the Apostles, we must neither of us exclusively claim the disciple (St. Ignatius) of this Prince of the Apostles." (Letters of St. Gregory, Book X, Ep. 39).

In reference to the word "Prince", it is indisputable that the Church had, and has understood the leadership of St. Peter among the Twelve, not over the Twelve. Among those who had made

this observation was St. Augustine who points to the distinction of the leadership of St. Peter among the Twelve, "in discipulis non in discipulos" (Sermon 10: On Peter and Paul). St. Cyprian was of the same opinion, for he states that St. Peter was invested with the same honor and authority as the rest of his colleagues. "Hoc erat utique et caeteri Apostoli quod suit Petrus pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis." (De Unitate Ecclesiae, Chap. IV). Similar to the position of St. Peter among the Twelve is the position of the Bishop of Rome among the other Bishops. The Church, defining this position, said that the Bishop of Rome is the first among his equal Bishops: "Primus inter pares." This was not granted because of his being the successor of St. Peter, but for the political significance of the city of Rome (Διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν, Canon 28, Fourth Ecumenical Council).

If it were otherwise what city on earth would question the spiritual and religious significance of the Holy City of Jerusalem? For it was there that our Lord lived, taught, suffered and was risen. It was there that the Holy Spirit descended on the Blessed Theotokos and Virgin Mary and the Apostles. There St. Peter first preached and wrought miracles and strengthened the first Christians with his confession. It was there that the Apostolic Synod took place. The blood of the first Christian Martyrs was shed on the soil of the Holy City, Jerusalem. As we know, the Bishops of Jerusalem never proclaimed their position superior to those of their colleagues. Only after the decision of the Fourth Ecumenical Council did the Church in Jerusalem receive the title "Mother of Churches" and her Bishop was named Patriarch, however, fifth in the line of Patriarchs. Justly St. Avitus, Bishop of Vieme wrote to the Patriarch of Jerusalem:

"Your apostolate exercises a primacy granted to it by God: and it is careful to show that it occupies a principal place (principem locum) in the Church not only by its privileges, but by its merits." (Work of St. Avitus, edit by Sirmond, Vol. II).

The results show that neither demands for positions of primacy nor titles of honor proved useful in the life of the Church. The writings of Pope St. Gregory I on the occasion of a title granted to Patriarch John the Faster of Constantinople by Emperor Maurice speak for themselves. The Emperor, following the practice initiated by his predecessors, decided to make it official in granting the title "Ecumenical" to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This title, other than being honorary had no added privileges in the administrative affairs of the Church. The position of the Patriarch of Constantinople remained the same as was, prior to the new title, within the geographical limits fixed by order of the Ecumenical Council. Until today the Ecumenical Patriarch has no jurisdiction in the Ecclesiastical affairs of the other Patriarchates and autocephalous Churches, except that he enjoys the privilege of being the first Bishop among his equal brother Bishops. The position of the Bishop of Rome was sim-

ilar. The Patriarch of Rome had no jurisdiction over all Italy. Though recognized as the chief Bishop of the West, the first Bishop among all Bishops of the Catholic Church, his diocese remained within the limits of the Roman territory, Southern Italy and the three Islands. Northern Italy was not included in his diocese. It was dependent on the Diocese of Milan. St. Athanasius was cognizant of this fact when in his Letter to Solitius, he called Rome the Metropolis of the Roman territory and Milan the Metropolis of Italy.

If, then, Pope St. Gregory I had reasons to complain for the usage of an honorary, empty title "Far from us be the words that puff up vanity and wound charity", what would he say about his successors? They are invested with the heathen title of Pontifex Maximus, Bishop of Bishops infallible interpreter of the Dogmas "non ex consensu Ecclesiae", but ex officio, as Bishop of Rome and successor to St. Peter, from whom emanates the Episcopal dignity and power. What would he say reading the chapter "De Romano Pontifice" in the *Theologia* by Cardinal Bellarmine: "In case that the pope made a mistake and recommended sin and forbade virtue, the Church has to accept sin as good and virtue as vice." (Si autem Papa erraret, praecipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, tenemur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes mala. *Theologia Bellarmino De Romana Pontifice*, Book 4, Chap. 23). What would the Saint say upon reading what Cardinal Zabarella had written about the authority of the Pope, stating that in some extent his authority is larger than that of God, because the Pope, as God, can do whatever he desires, even forbidden actions which God cannot do . . . "in that the Pope's authority is greater than God's". ("Deus et Papa faciunt unum consistorium . . . Papa potest quasi omnia quae facit Deus . . . et Papa facit quidquid libet, etiam illicita, et est ergo plus quam Deus". Cardinalius Zabarella, *De Schism, Innocent VII*; See also "My Return to Orthodoxy" by Paul Fr. Ballester, Convalier, Athens, 1954, pp. 27-29).

Undoubtedly the Saint would hide his face. Here is what he wrote to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria who, writing to St. Gregory, addressed him as Ecumenical Patriarch:

"Still I do not find that your Holiness has perfectly remembered what I particularly wished to impress on your memory. For I said that you should no more give the title to me than to others; And lo! in the subscription of your letter, you give to me, who have proscribed them, the vain glorious titles of Ecumenical and of Pope. May your sweet Holiness do so no more in the future. I beseech you: For you take from yourself what you give in excess to another. I do not ask to increase in dignities, but in virtues. I do not esteem an honour, which causes my brethren to lose their own dignity." (*Letters of St. Gregory*, Book VII; see also Abbe Guettee: *The Papacy*, p. 297).

If St. Cyprian were alive today, would he not be alarmed

upon witnessing the superactualization, that of the theory which he fought so vehemently, the theory that there is a Bishop of Bishops or that the authority of the Church is authentic when it is in harmony with the wishes of the Pope. One may find such declarations in the Prolegomena of *Institutiones Canonicae* by Devoti (Chap. 2 et sect. I,5).

"None of us", St. Cyprian wrote, "places himself in the position of the Bishop of Bishops. Each bishop enjoys full liberty and total jurisdiction." (Consil. Carthag., St. Cyprian, Benedictine edition, pp. 327-330.)

The fact that by a synodical decision the Church of Africa refuted the Bishop of Rome, who at that time was not on good terms with the Bishop of Alexandria, and the fact that the Synod of Arelate issued a decision on the conflict between the Bishop of Rome and the Bishops of Africa in relation to the question of rebaptizing the heretics, offer historical proofs that no Bishop or Patriarch was considered a Bishop of Bishops. ("Codex Canon. Ecclesiae Africanae", No. 101, Mansi: *Summa Conciliorum Act. Consil. Arelat.*, Can. VIII)

It is possible to bring forth the testimonies of many Saints and Doctors concerning this subject, but neither Your Eminence has the time to examine them, nor am I myself free to arrange and call them to your attention with this letter.

I should like, however, to entertain some thoughts about the attempts of the Popes to bring about reunion. These efforts, Your Eminence considers as proof of the good intentions of the Popes to bridge the Schism. In your esteemed letter, the name of Pope Innocent III is mentioned, a Pope who severely condemned the Crusaders when they deceitfully captured Constantinople 750 years ago. However, one may study the motives of Pope Innocent, in the light of history, in letters that he had directed to the various leaders of the Crusade. In a letter to Marquis of Monferrat, one of the chiefs of the Crusades, Pope Innocent writes:

"The Greeks, notwithstanding the bad treatment they suffer from those who wish to force them to return to the obedience of the Roman Church, cannot make up their minds to do so, because they see crimes and works of darkness in the Latins, and they hate them like dogs . . . But the judgments of God are impenetrable . . . It may be that the Greeks have been justly punished for their sins . . . Let us leave these doubtful questions. This is certain, that you may keep and defend the land which is conquered for you by the decision of God; upon this condition, however, that you will restore the possessions of the Churches and that you always remain faithful to the Holy See and to us."

The same Pope obeying the Latin Emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin Count of Flanders, sent a circular letter to the Bishops of France asking them to send Latin clergymen and books to Byzantium to help the Latin movement to latinize Constantinople:

"Send to that country all the books you can spare, at least to have them copied, that the Church of the East may agree with that of the West in the praises of God."

This same Pope, although he previously rejected as anti-canonical the election of Thomas Morozine as Patriarch of Constantinople, later, in order to exercise the prerogative of the office of the Bishop of Bishops, he appointed Thomas as Patriarch. In a letter to him he wrote:

"In mixed bishoprics you will ordain Latins, and give them preference over the Greeks. If you cannot bring the Greeks to the Latin ritual, you must suffer them to keep their own until the Holy See otherwise orders."

According to historians Pope Innocent was responsible for the deterioration of the relations between East and West. It was he who established Latin Patriarchs in Jerusalem and Constantinople and Bishoprics in provinces under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Church. His successors continued the same policy towards the East. (See Fleury: *Histoire Ecclesiastic. Liv. IXXXIII*, 32). One may see the feelings of the West toward the East in the letter of Pope Urban IV to Louis IX, King of France. He tried to convince the French King to help the expelled Latin Emperor of Constantinople recapture his throne. This Pope endeavored to arouse Europe to help the Latin Emperor, who, as he put it in the aforementioned letter, was "Expelled by the schismatic Greeks to the shame of the West."

The motives therefore of the Popes in their endeavors to bridge the chasm separating East and West were not, as Your Eminence describes them, beyond reproach, pure and innocent as they should have been. For this reason they remained ineffective and negative.

Another proof of this sad fact is the example of Nicholas III in regard to the decisions of the Synod of Lyon (1274). This Synod was called at the insistence of Emperor Michael Palaeologos VII. He was hoping to receive military assistance from the Western Kings through the influence of Pope Gregory X. When the successor of Gregory, Pope Nicholas III, sent his delegates to the East to actualize the terms of the union, according to the decisions of the Synod in Lyon, he gave them written instructions how to proceed. These instructions came to light in 1898, when the manuscript was published by J. Gay, "Les Registres

de Nicholas III" (see *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, No. 1, pp. 19-24).

According to this publication, Pope Nicholas gave orders so that the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople, with the additional clause "Filioque" was to be sung by both the Greeks and Latins. As for the Liturgical Greek rites, the Pope ordered that only those rites be retained which seemed to the Apostolic See as not impairing the integrity of the Catholic Faith or the Sacred Canons. ("Ipso in illis eorum ritibus de quibus sedi Apostolice visum fuerit, quod per eos catholice fidei non ledatur integritas ne sacrorum statutis canonum derogetur.") For the clergy, the Papal instructions seem more strict:

"The Patriarch and the rest of the clergy of every fortress, village, or any other place, all and each singly, recognize, accept and confess with a sworn oath the truth of the faith and primacy of the Roman Church . . . without any condition or addition."

Only upon these conditions could the clergy obtain confirmation of their offices and rank from the papal delegates. "Super confirmatione status sui . . . petere curaverunt."

How was it possible for such terms to be accepted? The results and the events that follow the arrival of the papal legates in the East speak for themselves. The people and clergy were greatly disappointed and naturally, the terms were rejected for they were asking the abandonment of the sacred tradition of the Catholic Church and the subjugation to the Papal autocratic plans.

It is therefore evidently clear that the efforts for the union were destined to fail for the element of success—Christian love—was absent. On account of this absence St. Bernard of Clairvaux wrote to Pope Eugene III as follows:

"There is union as far as religious questions are concerned excepting perhaps unimportant questions, but we are separated in love." (See "Rome and the Eastern Church", by A. Rogosh, p. 38, paragraph 83).

And today, though both sides recognize that many and great are the elements of common doctrine between East and West, we witness the absence of love. Love is absent from our hearts. It has been exiled by the unspeakable anti-Christian actions of the Crusaders; by the effort of the various Western Ecclesiastics to latinize the Eastern worship, though as A. Rogosh wrote: "comparatively very few Supreme Pontiffs have lent themselves to 'Latinizations'." (L.C. p. 46)

And what is happening today? And today love is not permitted to show itself. The phraseology of His Excellency, Amleto

G. Cicognani, Papal Delegate to the United States in the booklet that Your Eminence had sent to me does not show any love at all. His Excellency, in addressing the Eucharistic Congress of the Eastern Rites in Chicago, 1941, has failed to show respect to the venerable antiquity of the Eastern Liturgical Rite. It considers the "Epiclesis" a "dogmatic error" of "some dissidents of the East" (The Eastern Rites" by His Excellency, A. G. Cicognani, p. 6). One really wonders if such expressions show love or serve the cause of union; one wonders if such words are proper to be addressed to Christians, who though Western, they desire as much as they are permitted to keep intact the Liturgical Rite of their former Ecclesiastical life in which their fathers received the seal of salvation. Undoubtedly, the Papal Delegate to the United States overlooked some historical proofs concerning the topic of the "Epiklesis". For it is an element characteristic to all ancient Liturgies, from the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus, the Liturgy in the 8th Book of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Liturgy of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. The dominical words: "Take, eat, this is my Body . . . Drink ye all of This, this is my Blood . . ." have their own significant position and meaning in the Canon of the Liturgy. For this reason their part in the Liturgy is known as the Anaphora (Reference). Historical reference has no power whatsoever to change the Eucharistic elements without the invocation, the Epiclesis:

"And make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup the Precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit."

If only the use of the "historical reference" was sufficient the ancient Fathers certainly would have known. Was there an error in the ancient Church in not considering the words of institution of the Sacrament as endowed with, so to say, magical power for the completion of the Sacrament? That is what seems to be believed by the Papal Delegate when he calls the Epiklesis a "dogmatic error". You see, Your Eminence, what extremes we reach when we try, without love, to approach our differences? We even present ourselves disrespectful toward the Saints, for they are the authors of the Liturgy.

And today we repeat the same thing. The preachers of hatred and atheism show admirable cooperation while we who profess to be the preachers of love and sacrifice, hide ourselves under anti-Christian formalities, and keep love outside of our hearts, for we do not even think to exchange letters of friendship, and express our participation in each other's joy or sorrow. East and West therefore are mostly separated by a lack of love.

In reference to the need to initiate cooperation between East and West, Your Eminence points out the fact that the invitations extended to the leaders of the Eastern Church by Pope Pius IX, Leo XIII and by the now reigning Pontiff, Pope Pius XII

have been rejected. I should like to bring to your attention some facts which prove that the invitations of Pope Pius IX were not in consonance with the traditions of the Church of the first eight centuries. Here are the facts:

On October 3rd, 1863, Patriarch Gregory VI granted an audience to the Monks who carried him the invitation of Pope Pius IX, asking to attend the Vatican Council. The Patriarch observed that the content of the invitation was published before its delivery. He also reminded the Papal emissaries that the call of an Ecumenical Council had never rested on the opinion and decision of a single Patriarch, but only after the exchange of views and the agreement of the other Patriarchs who were of equal honor and rank (ὁμοβάθμιοι, ἰσότητιοι). The Patriarch having in mind the record of the New Testament and the example of the Saints, such as St. Cyprian, added the following remarks. He emphasized the inability of the Orthodox Church to agree, in opposition to the Holy Spirit: 1. that the Apostles were not equal, 2. that there is a Bishop of Bishops, 3. that the prerogatives and privileges of any Patriarchal See are rested not on human (synodical decisions) but on divine law and authority, as is the Western contention for the Bishop of Rome.

Similar views were expressed by Patriarch Anthimus when Pope Leo XIII invited the Eastern Church leaders to unity (July 20, 1874). The Pope by the word "union" failed to mention the unity of the Faith as it was common to both East and West before the Schism. The form and contents of invitation and of other papal documents; directives given by papal servants that all bishops should kneel in the presence of the Pope; the declarations that the Pope is the infallible Vicar of Christ on Earth to whom all bishops owe allegiance and submit to his orders; all these and others make the Pope unrecognizable in the eyes of the Eastern Patriarchs. If, in the papal documents and invitations, the spirit of Pope Gregory I were prevalent, that is the spirit of brotherly equality, the Eastern Patriarchs would not reject them.

And today, in case that the leadership of the Church of Rome sincerely desires reunion, as it was before the Schism, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, should invite the Patriarchs of the East as their first and equal brother, "Primus inter pares". He should discuss with them the conditions created to the detriment of the Church after 1054. Who would dare reject such a brotherly invitation rooted in love and showing respect for the venerable traditions of the first eight centuries? Who would say no to such an angelic message seeking to initiate friendly relations for better understanding between East and West? Who would turn his back when the voice of brotherhood seeks cooperation in love and mutual trust to achieve that beautiful dream, reunion, so strongly desired by both sides.

It is a fact that today the Uniate movement instigated by the

Vatican is against such friendly relations and against the cultivation of love and brotherhood. This movement, being a conscious or unconscious response of responsibility for the cause of the Schism, is a method used by the Roman Church to seek in herself the solution of the problem of the Schism, or as we say, is the Roman way to make the East submit to the West.

In your esteemed letter, Your Eminence says ever since 1862: "There has been a special department for the Eastern Churches in Rome, called the Sacred Oriental Church. This is the powerful agency of the Popes to work for reunion day after day." Being given that, this "powerful agency" endeavors to establish reunion between East and West on terms known from the Encyclicals of the Popes and other official documents and not on the terms recorded in the history of the Church's life during the first eight centuries. This powerful agency will fail, for it attempts to overrule the practices of the Saints. The very existence and activities of this agency will stand as a cause for deterioration of relations between East and West, making the Christian people and the workers of the Church suspect each other.

In reference to the successful activities of the Uniate movement, partly enumerated by Your Eminence in your esteemed letter, I can say that the facts give a different report. Since 1936, without any effort on behalf of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, only in the United States of America, more than 75 thousand Uniate Ukrainians and Carpatho-Russians found the way back to their Mother Orthodox Church. Two Bishops have been assigned for them. They have been nominated by the people and elected by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Bishop Orestes of Agathonikeia is in charge of the Carpatho-Russian congregations while Bishop Bohdan of Eucarpia for the Ukrainian. The "every day reunions with Rome on the part of the Orthodox" in the Middle East mentioned by Your Eminence indicate no depth of faith but depth of fear. The political fear on the one hand, and the material assistance on the other that the Roman Church is capable to offer to the unfortunate refugees, are the real factors of those so-called reunions. One, therefore, must not give full credence to such information and statistics of reunion.

I imagine that Your Eminence is cognizant of the fact that something similar to the Western Uniate Movement has made its appearance in the Orthodox Church. This is the Latin Rite Orthodox, corresponding to the Uniate Greek Rite within the Roman Catholic Church. In France and Belgium this movement, a product of the Studies of Patristic Theology, began to take great proportions. Recently I read in the paper of the Ecumenical Patriarchate "Apostolos Andreas" that the Latin Rite Orthodox people of France had submitted to the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I a report in regard to their activities and progress. The Basilian Fathers in New York and in other States

are leaders of this movement in this Country. They have their own Bishops and Priests united with the Orthodox Church. They perform the Holy Sacraments according to the Latin Rite professing the Faith of the Seven Ecumenical Councils. For more information I send Your Eminence the periodical and selected tracts of the Latin Rite Orthodox Basilian Fathers whose Monastery is located in West Mount Vernon, N.Y., 72 Kingsbridge Road.

In regard to this movement nothing official has been said by the Orthodox Church concerning hope and possibility that through it the Western Church might be influenced to return to that position she held before the Schism. For this reason we consider this movement rather a free effort initiated by Roman Catholic students of true Ecclesiastical History and Patristic Theology. In their desire to evaluate the doctrinal difference of the two Churches freely they were converted to Orthodoxy and rejected all dogmas added by the Western Church since her separation from the Eastern. The Orthodox does not seek to place this movement under submission or change its liturgical rite in order to recognize it or to offer it financial assistance. Simply, the Orthodox Church accepts the existence of this group of adherents to the Doctrines which were common to the East and West since the beginning, holding each other in the unity of the Faith.

There are those, however, who entertain the idea that the Orthodox Church leaders should declare these Latin Rite Orthodox Uniates with their lay and Clergy members the Holy Western Church and their hierarchs as bishops "in Partibus infidelium", to concentrate on the work for the return of the schismatic Roman Church back to the Catholic Faith in its purity. There are some who recommend the election of one from among the Latin Rite Orthodox Prelates to be considered as Patriarch and Pope of the Western Church, and thus the schism between the West and East might be ended. One really wonders what the reactions would be of those who understand and are capable of evaluating Ecclesiastical order and Tradition, were this method followed to put an end to the Schism.

Unfortunately, this method is pursued by the Roman Church through the Greek Rite Uniate Movement. This is the purpose of the "powerful agency" which, according to your esteemed letter, studies the affairs of the Oriental Church. This is also the purpose of the Papal recommendation as to the introduction in all Seminaries of courses on the Eastern Liturgical Rites and the organization of annual conferences, such as that at Fordham University at which Your Eminence presided many times.

Such efforts from both sides are not conducive to love, and instead of bringing the two parts together, they enlarge the chasm of separation. They hold apart the Christian people of the East and West to the detriment of the Church and the rejoicing of Satan and his servants.

It is indeed true, as Your Eminence has observed, that the Orthodox Church claims all doctrinal development completed and ended with the Seven Ecumenical Councils. The unequivocal acceptance of all definitions and decisions of these Councils is considered indispensable for the protection of the Faith and the salvation of souls. These are unshakable foundations of Orthodox Doctrines resting on both written and unwritten Christian Tradition. Because of these convictions we view all additions conceived in the West after the Schism as having no roots in Christian Tradition. We agree with others that these additions have not aided the growth of the Church. Instead, they have caused further splits and schisms within the body of the Western Church. One might mention the example of the Old Catholics who cut themselves off from the Western Church owing to the decisions of the last Council of the Vatican. It is, therefore, our conviction that aside from the official Ecumenical Doctrines of the Undivided Church we are unable to see and accept any other authority to influence our discussions and to direct our work toward the reunion of East and West.

Certainly, in the expansion and formulation of these doctrinal decisions the Western Church took an active part by official delegations representing the Holy Patriarch of the West, and as Your Eminence observes, these delegates signed the decisions and definitions of the Orthodox Faith "first", in the name of the Pope. The important thing however, is not who signed first or last; the important thing is the confirmation of the truth signed in the decisions. Among other things, through these decisions we learn the true meaning of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, who is considered the first among all the Bishops of the Church, though equal in honor and rank with the others. However, the old concepts as compared with the new decisions regarding the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome put us at a loss for words. For the Pope has been placed above the authority of the Ecumenical Councils by being declared infallible "non ex consensu Ecclesiae" but due to his authority as the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ on earth.

Reflecting on this point brings to my mind an historical event that took place in 404 A.D. when the pseudosynod near the Oak condemned and dethroned St. John Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople. St. John and his associates directed letters to the Bishops of the Western Churches, to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, to Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, seeking their help. Pope Innocent answered the letters of St. John saying that God would soon deliver him and his friends by means of an Ecumenical Council which he said he was laboring to have assembled.

Now if this Pope did not recognize in himself the right and the authority to decide such a simple case by using the sacred canons and common justice, one justly wonders how much he

would deny himself the right to decide doctrinal questions. Pope Innocent, speaking the innocent language of the Holy Traditions of the Church, did not show any sign of accepting the theory of infallibility with which his successors have been invested.

We still hold the very same concept that was so admirably interpreted by Pope Innocent. We stand, as he stood, on the very same basis, constantly claiming that only an Ecumenical Council has the authority to speak and interpret the dogmas of the Orthodox Faith infallibly. It is, therefore, evident why we consider the doctrinal development of the Church as ended and resting on the authority of the Seven Ecumenical Councils. On account of this conviction we cannot accept as infallible dogmas of the Church formulated in the West following the Schism, such as, the infallibility of the Pope, the Immaculate Conception and the Bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Only the authority of the Ecumenical Council can speak and define the Orthodox dogmas infallibly, when they are based on Divine Revelation and needed for the salvation of our souls.

According to your esteemed letter, Your Eminence considers the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary and her Bodily Assumption into heaven as being believed in the East and only denied when "the Pope undertook to define these doctrines." I sincerely believe that these doctrines were dictated by a superabundance of love, piety and devotion to our Lady. However, the Orthodox Church, which expresses limitless piety, love and devotion to the Blessed Theotokos, has not found anything in the records of Christian Tradition with regard to the possibility of a human being's conception and birth free from sin as well as saved before the salvation that the Incarnate Son of God brought to our fallen nature. We find only one immaculate conception in the sacred records of Christian Tradition, that of our Lord, God and Savior Jesus Christ, born of the all-holy Virgin Mary, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The acceptance of every other "conception", dictated even by true piety and love, as I believe is true of the Bull "Ineffabilis Deus" of Pope Pius IX, leads to conclusions contrary to Christian Tradition and limits the general character of the Redemptive Mission of our Lord in the world.

Indeed, the holiness of the Blessed Virgin is supreme. Her purity is unquestionable, as achieved in her nature by the Holy Spirit during the moment of the Annunciation. Her ever-virginity, the fact of her being the Mother of God, the multitude of her virtues, graces and spiritual powers, her motherly intercessions for our salvation, all these and many other qualities have inspired some of the Holy Fathers and Christian orators and poets to use words in praise of the Blessed Theotokos which one may take as conveying the meaning of the dogma concerning the Immaculate Conception. However, rhetorical and poetic

expressions, though signs of piety, "vestigia pietatis", have no roots in Divine Revelation and cannot be taken as basic elements of Christian Doctrine, demanding as such acceptance by us for our salvation.

This can be found in the Orthodox pronouncements upon the occasion of the new dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. In his encyclical "Munificentissimus Deus", His Holiness, Pope Pius XII has declared the new dogma to be unquestionably accepted by the members of the Western Church and has attempted to prove its authenticity with references to Patristic thought. His Holiness quotes from the Eastern theologians St. John Damascene, St. Germanos, Patriarch of Constantinople and the "En-gomion on the Dormition of the Virgin Mary" attributed to St. Modestus, Patriarch of Jerusalem. (See the *Dogma of the Assumption*, Paulist Fathers Press, pp. 12-14). These quotations and all the others from the western theologians cannot be taken as authoritative. They are personal expressions of devotion and do not bear the seal of Christian antiquity.

Many articles have been published by Orthodox theologians on the new dogma. I humbly think that the most clear and concise interpretation of the Orthodox views were given by His Eminence, Archbishop Michael of North and South America and by a lay Russian Orthodox Theologian, Mr. Pierre Covalesky. Archbishop Michael, in an article published in the Orthodox Observer, No. 413, said:

"The Church dogmatized about the All-holy Mother only when it was necessary for the salvation of our souls, that is when the Church spoke in regard to the Birth of the Savior from the Virgin. The Church said: 'She gave birth as a Virgin and remained a Virgin' (Παρθένος ἔτεκε καὶ Παρθένος ἔμεινε). She is Theotokos and not Christotokos. As for the Assumption the Church believes that 'the third day after her entombment, the Theotokos appeared and said to the Apostles rejoice. And because of this they understood her as being bodily ascended.'"

The views of Professor Covalesky were published in the French paper *Le Monde*, Paris, Oct. 19, 1950. I read a refutation on the views in the magazine *Unitas* (Vol. II, p. 225) published in Rome by Unitas. The article of *Unitas* fervently tries to prove these views untrue, not rooted in Christian Tradition; however without success. It is really strange why its author considers as "development of modern times" the view according to which the dogma emanates from Divine Revelation and is expressed by the Ecumenical Council and its acceptance is required by the whole Church (*Unitas*, Vol. II, pp. 235). Was not this the way that the Undivided Church, when forced by heresies, denials and doubts, used to define dogmas as the infallible interpreter and defender of Christian Orthodoxy? This historical view

is meant in the Russian term "Sobonost". This view is as old as the Councils. History is the witness of this truth. However, history cannot testify for the antiquity of the view expounded in the article of *Unitas* and by Your Eminence, in the third page of your esteemed letter "Definition of the doctrine by the Pope is merely the seal of confirmation that a doctrine has always been believed in the practice of the Church". For us the Ecumenical Council holds this seal and it is used only when there is a universal agreement in defining a dogma proved to be grounded in Divine Revelation and considered as necessary for the salvation of our souls.

For any one, either Roman Catholic or not, is free to ask: "Does salvation necessarily depend on the acceptance of the new dogma?" The answer given already by the Roman Church is yes. Our answer is different. We consider ample benefit the spiritual uplifting that we acquire from the various feasts and services dedicated to the Blessed Mother. We consider indispensable the guidance we find in her to approach Christ and her intercessions and prayers for us. We do observe the feast of her Assumption. However, we consider it unnecessary to define it as dogma. Is it necessary to declare as dogma the Assumption of St. John the Divine? For he had ascended also according to Tradition and the Liturgical custom which we observe September 26th. My humble opinion is that by such definitions we do not contribute to the growth of the Faith within us. The opposite is true. We limit the receptive potentialities of the people to accept the truth of the Christian Faith and be saved. We widen the chasm of separation and deter the progress of the Kingdom of God.

The stand, however, that the Orthodox Catholic Church takes in these matters, being in conformity with the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils, does no harm to the progress of the Faith. Instead of adding new obstacles to the old, the Orthodox Church considers the doctrinal development complete for the salvation of our souls. In inviting the cooperation of other Christian groups, the Orthodox Church contributes admirable efforts to achieve togetherness and be under One Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord, God and Savior.

We do agree with Your Eminence that the Roman Church both in this Country and all over the world has great contributions to show in social work. In the field of cooperation, however, with other Christian groups one does not see the dynamic participation shown by the Roman Catholic Church in other endeavors. In the struggle to expose the danger of Communism the Roman Church has contributed immensely. Nevertheless, in the effort to create a common front with the other groups participating to check the advance of Communism and Liberalism, the Roman Church has not shown as yet any willingness to encourage the formation of such a dynamic common Christian

front. What a powerful unit the Christian world would create against its enemy and against sin if the Roman Church were willing to take the initiative for its formation. The influence of the Christian world would be proven beyond all expectations. The door of Christian love and brotherhood would be opened to all who believe in Christ as their Lord, God and Savior and are ready to work for His glory.

For such a work the well-known doctrinal differences offer no obstacle. The Orthodox Church, though deeply aware of these differences, considers the need of cooperation with all Christian groups as a binding duty, as a call from above, to work for the unity of all and the protection of our civilization. The dictum that we cannot have morality without dogma, as mentioned in your esteemed letter, is valid for us. For we do not accept humanism and liberalism nor any autonomy in ethics or the possibility of morality without religion. However, the dogmatical differences that hold the Christian world apart are no obstacle in the field of cooperation to practice Christian Ethics. We cannot deny that among Protestants we find Christian morality living, emanating from the everliving source of the New Testament. The Law of Love, the foundation of Christian Morality, did not change among them though the dogmas and the methods of scriptural interpretation were changed. On account of this one might say that though in matters of Faith the Protestant world shows numerous omissions, nevertheless, in the sphere of Christian Morality, they offer to us, Eastern and Western Christians alike, an admirable example of sound application of the Commandments of the Lord.

We cannot say that the Protestants are not Christians on the basis of the dictum that morality without dogma is impossible, and thus conclude that cooperation with them is to no avail. The fact that in some denominations we have the revival of some ancient heresies does not destroy the character of their Baptism. That was the contention of the ancient Church and mainly held by the Western. The Popes Steven and Sixtus denied the contention of St. Cyprian of Carthage and St. Dionysios of Alexandria that rebaptizing of repentant heretics was unsound. Though there are some fluctuations on this question in the opinion of the Holy Fathers, the prevailing idea of the ancient Church was to accept the repentant heretics not by Baptism but by Confirmation (Eusebius: *Church History*, Book 8, II, III). This is what the Orthodox Church does to this day.

Having in mind this practice of the ancient Church as well as the love and faith in Christ shown by the Protestants and their desire to know and make known the Bible, the Orthodox Church does not deny the character of a Christian in the Protestants and does not hesitate to declare that there exists among them vestiges of the Church, "*Vestigia Ecclesiae*".

After all, who are we, both Western and Eastern Christians, to deny to others the title of Christian and confirm the absence of Christian morality in their life? Here is what St. Paul says:

"Who are you to pass judgment on the servant of another? It is before his own master that he stands or falls. And he will be upheld, for the master is able to make him stand. Why do you despise your brother? All we shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ . . . If a man who is uncircumcised keeps the precepts of the Law will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision?" (Rom. 14:4-10; 2:25).

Therefore, by analogy, we cannot deny that there are elements of the Church outside her walls, "extra muros", souls that confess Christ as their Lord, God and Savior.

Holding this position the Orthodox Church does not hesitate to associate herself with Roman Catholic and Protestant brothers and to study in the spirit of Christian love religious and social matters, on the basis and strength of the Faith of the first eight centuries as it has been kept within the Orthodox Church unaltered and immaculate. Certainly, we are cognizant of the difficulties and problems inherent to the Ecumenical movement. For though the divided Christians use common Christian terms, they understand different meanings. The experience we acquire by taking part in theological discussions of this kind has shown that there is no common theological language spoken by all consciously and clearly. Even Biblical terminology in Ecumenical gatherings is used ambiguously.

Nevertheless, it is better to witness our shortcomings in sorrow than remain apart from each other and do nothing to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ. Understanding that our place in the Ecumenical gatherings is to witness to the Orthodox Faith, we try to enlighten the others as to its contents and meaning. We try to help wavering theological thought to ground itself on the firm foundation of Patristic thought. The comments that were heard in Evanston when His Eminence Archbishop Michael read the report of the Orthodox Delegation on the theme: "Christ the Hope of the World" prove and confirm just what I am trying to state.

The hope of the world was proven identical with the Kingdom of God, a fact of the future and, at the same time, a living experience of today, realized in the Church. Those who are united with the Church by their faithful participation in the Holy Sacraments understand the meaning and beauty of this experience. At the end of the report the Anglican Bishop of Durham, the Rt. Rev. A. M. Ramsey, took the floor and with deep emotion emphasized his agreement with the "glorious report"

of the Orthodox Delegation. A Roman Catholic journalist wrote an article published in the "Living Church" (Sept. 9, 1954) that if Roman Catholic delegates or observers were present in Evanston, their views in such a theological atmosphere would have been very near the views of the Orthodox Delegation. And he adds: "There is not the least doubt that Evanston was for a time one of the places where the Spirit breathed".

In the light of such sincere and optimistic views, expressed by a Roman Catholic, I am sure that Your Eminence will find, besides other things, the reason why the Orthodox Church is present at Ecumenical gatherings. Because consciously knowing that she possesses the fulness of truth of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is without blemish or spot, the Orthodox Church deeply feels that by taking part in the Ecumenical Movement she offers help, as much as possible, to the Christian World and contributes to the effort to heal the sixth wound of the Body of Christ, the schism and separation.

These facts I thought necessary to enumerate above in order to clarify some points contained in your esteemed letter, hoping that Your Eminence may re-evaluate the views of the Orthodox Catholic Church, which are the same yesterday, today and will be tomorrow.

May the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, Who lives in the Church, guide the leaders of the Holy Western Church to extend hands of cooperation in love and sincerity to the leaders of the Holy Eastern Church and to others, so that the sixth wound that was opened in the most Holy and precious Body of the Saviour since 1054 and during the Reformation of the 16th century might be treated properly and through our love from day to day be healed. For it is through love that we will achieve the unity of Faith again: Through love we will bring on earth the full glory of the Kingdom of God, according to its prototype in heaven.

With sincere best wishes and brotherly regards,

I am faithfully Yours in Christ,

† ATHENAGORAS

Bishop of Elaia

Los Angeles, California
The Feast of St. Catherine
(Thanksgiving Day) 1954

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ON THE HIERARCHY OF THE CHURCH

Rev. John Papadopoulos
Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

The Hierarchy of the Christian Church, divinely instituted, derives from the very character of the Church understood as the invisible and visible community of believers. St. Ignatius, in stressing the bond between the Church and its Hierarchy, goes as far as to contend that there can be no Church without a Hierarchy.¹

The Church, established by our Lord Jesus Christ for the purpose of perpetuating His redemptive work, is in need of a directive body in whose hands, as the dispensers of the Gospel and commands of Christ, the spiritual safeguarding of its members is to be entrusted. All authority which issues in practice from this directive body, however, cannot be accepted otherwise but as a continuation of the threefold office of the Lord as Prophet, Priest and King. Such an authority was actually imparted by the Lord to His Apostles after His resurrection, and in turn by the Apostles themselves to the presbyters, bishops and deacons ordained by them. These successors of the Apostles together with all those who have followed subsequently through ordination, in an unbroken succession, constitute the Hierarchy of the Church.

Jesus Christ as the High Priest imparted His Word through His Apostles to all nations, wrought miracles testifying to His divine Truth, and in general appointed His Apostles to be executors of the New Covenant between God and man, and through them sanctified His Church "which he hath purchased with his own blood".²

The Apostles in turn, having established the Church upon

1. Πρὸς Τράλλ. γ'.
2. Acts, XX, 28
3. 1, Cor., III, 11

Jesus Christ as the foundation,³ imparted through the laying of hands divine Grace to the seven deacons first, and afterwards to presbyters and to bishops of the local churches, with the right and authority to «πομαίνειν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ».⁴

Thus the Hierarchy of the Church goes back in an unbroken succession to the Lord Himself Who, according to St. Paul, "gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of saints; for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God . . .".⁵

St. Paul clearly indicates by the above the unique importance of the work entrusted to the Hierarchy, empowered as it is with the authority granted by the Holy Spirit through ordination,⁶ according to the sayings of the Lord Himself when He declared that "he that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me".⁷ St. Paul, pointing out the superiority of the Hierarchy over the spiritual fold, as manifested by the above saying of the Lord, exhorts the body of the faithful to be obedient to the Hierarchy by saying: "obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch over your souls, as they that must give account".⁸ It follows then, that the Church is divided in two: those who govern, and those who are governed, i.e., clergy and laity. And yet the Church remains one body, the body of Christ, as Gregory the Theologian remarks: «οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐν σῶμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, εἰ δὲ καθ' ἓνα Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀλλήλων μέλη. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχει καὶ προκαθίσταται, τὸ δὲ ἄγεται καὶ εὐθύνεται καὶ οὔτε τ' αὐτὸν ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι καὶ γίνεται ἀμφοτέρω ἐν, εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συναρμολογούμενα καὶ συντιθέμενα Πνεύματος.»⁹

That the Apostles were appointed successors of Christ is unquestionable as it appears from the overwhelming evidence of both the Holy Scriptures and Tradition. The Lord Himself, for example, clearly defines the nature of the succession to which He appointed His disciples by speaking to them after His resurrection in the following terms: "as my father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them; Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Further describing the purpose

3. 1 Cor., III, 11

4. Acts, XX, 28

5. Ephes. IV, 11

6. Matth. X, I. Luk. X, 1. John, VI, 71. Acts, II, 1

7. Luke, X, 16

8. Hebr. XIII, 17

9. Περὶ ἐκ. II. 36, 276 John, XIV, 26 XX, 21 XV, 16

and aims of the Apostles' call the Lord elsewhere says: "I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain."¹⁰

Carrying out the instructions of the Lord, and in so doing exercising the authority He gave to them, the Apostles "went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."¹¹ The Lord had promised to work with them forever in these words: and, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."¹² And by this the Lord intended to show that He is ever present within His Church, and that He is working invisibly with worthy representatives who as successors of His Apostles continue the work of the salvation of men through His Church.

The Apostles exercising the authority received from the Lord ordained presbyters whom they appointed their successors in the Apostolic ministry of the Church.¹³ These in turn, having been appointed in this way *συνεργοί* of the Grace of God, preached the divine Word, performed the sacraments and governed the Church as the vicars of Christ.¹⁴ Following on the example of the Apostles, the bishops imparted in the same manner the divine Grace and authority to others whom they considered qualified "to teach others also."¹⁵

It is undoubtedly in this way that the divinely instituted Hierarchy took shape from the very beginning of the history of the Church to whose spiritual needs it had to minister. The Christian clergy has been instituted by Christ for the purpose of effecting forever His redemptive work, for the spiritual re-birth of the believers, their sanctification and spiritual guidance. The clergy guides the believers through moral perfection so that they may become like God, in the words of St. Gregory the Theologian.¹⁶

It is evident, then, that from the very beginning the government of the Church was entrusted to the Pastors, and therefore there can be no Church without clergy properly appointed after being elected by the laity and ordained. It is apparent, on the other hand, that not all believers qualify to shoulder the burden

10. John XX, 21-23. XV, 16 Matth. XVIII, 18 XXVIII, 19, 20

11. Acts, V 42. VI, 1-5. Mark, XVII, 20

12. Matth. XXVIII, 20

13. Clement of Rome, A' Κορ. μβ'. «Κατὰ πόλεις καὶ χώρας κηρύσσοντες, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν δοκιμάσαντες τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν».

14. 2 Tim. IV, 2.

15. 2 Tim. II, 2. Titus, I, 6, 15. II, 12. 1 Tim. III, 119. 1 Cor. II, 12. 1 Tim. VI, 20. V, 17, 22. VI, 17. Titus, I, 5. 1 Peter, V, 12.

16. *Op. cit.*, II. 35, 432.

of the priestly diaconate, as St. Paul observes: "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers?"¹⁷ Interpreting St. Paul's realistic observations, Critopoulos testifies in the "Confession" written by him as follows: «Ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἀποστολικὸν ἔθος παρεδόθη τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, μὴ πάντας τοὺς χριστιανοὺς χωρεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων ἱερουργίαν, ἀλλ' ἐκλέγεσθαι ἐκ τούτων τοὺς κρείττους καὶ τῇ ἀρετῇ τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερέχοντας.»¹⁸ St. Paul in giving further reasons why not all believers qualify for the mission of the clergy says: "no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God."¹⁹ And further he asks: "how shall they preach, except they be sent?"²⁰

It is only thus that the Church acquires its full content and meaning as being the body of Jesus Christ; as that body whose head is Jesus Christ Himself, according to Dositheos, "Who holding the rudder in His own hands governs the Church through our holy Fathers. Consequently the Holy Spirit appointed the bishops as authorities and heads over those local churches which are properly instituted and which have their reference to our Leader and Savior to Whom they ascribe the authority and leadership they have over His Churches."²¹

That the full content and meaning of the Church can be understood only along these lines is shown by the early evidence of Cyprian who says: "the body of believers constitute the Church, united as they are around their priest. The flock is obedient to its shepherd. Hence the bishop in the Church and the Church in the bishop, and those who are not in communion with the bishop are not members of the Church."

Recapitulating the above evidence, one has to conclude that Jesus Christ, having saved man as "High Priest",²² has been the first "Pastor and overseer of our souls."²³ Having divinely willed that the work of man's salvation continues to the end of time, He instituted His Church, acting as a visible communion with Him, so that each man through the Church is enabled to acquire personally the gift of Grace for the purpose of his salvation. Aiming at man's salvation forever and ever Jesus entrusted the development and stabilization of His Church to His disciples and Apostles, to whom He transferred His supernatural mission in this world and imparted the authority of His three-fold office,

17. 1 Cor. XII, 29

18. Ch. ια'.

19. Hebr. V, 4

20. Romans, X, 15

21. «εἰ τις παρὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάξῃ, καὶ καταφρονῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐθέλῃ προάγειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω». Synod of Gagra, 6th Canon.

22. Hebr. X, 21

23. 1 Peter, II, 25

i.e., the right to teach men by revealing to them the true God and by making to them known His sacred Will (Prophetic), to perform the sacraments, and by them, as by visible signs, to impart invisibly to the believers the divine Grace (Priestly), and to govern the visible community of believers by exercising over them the supreme authority of the Spiritual Leader and Prince (Royal).

This supreme character of the Apostolic spiritual authority is clearly shown by the words of our Savior Himself by which He grants to His Apostles the undisputable authority to remit sins: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."²⁴

This great authority the Apostles, following on the example of the Lord Himself, bestowed upon their successors whom through ordination they appointed "servants and deacons of Christ, laborers and soldiers of His kingdom, architects and builders of the edifice of the Church, superiors and angels of the Church of God . . ."²⁵ It is with this authority that the clergy is appointed in the Church as ministers in the "diaconate of reconciliation" between God and man, an authority that springs from God and is unbroken and forever transmitted by the sacrament of priesthood. Ordination, according to the Orthodox Church, was prescribed to His Apostles by the Lord Himself, and it is until this day that whenever an ordination takes place it is performed through the very hands of the Apostles whom present-day bishops have succeeded in the administration of the sacraments for the purpose of working out the salvation of man.²⁶

The Offices of the Hierarchy

It must have become evident by now that the Offices of the Hierarchy are three in number; that of the bishop, of the presbyter and of the deacon. To all of these the priestly capacity and grace is imparted by the laying of hands which constitutes the principal part of the specific church ordination ceremony.

The office of the bishop was held by the Apostles who had been appointed to it by the first "Bishop", the Lord Himself. The eleven Apostles appoint Mathias in the place of Judas by prayer and lot. As the Church grew in numbers, as a result of the teaching of both the Twelve and the Seventy Apostles, Paul is called by revelation to the Apostolic office, formerly a persecutor of

24. Matth. XVIII,18

25. 1 Cor. III,5,6,9,41. 1 Tim. V,19. Philip. II,5. Hebr. XIII,17. Revel. I,20

26. Mogilas: question qø'.

the Church and now one of her bishops. Before that, James, the brother of the Lord, was appointed to the Apostolic office, thus becoming the first bishop of the Church in Jerusalem.

Originally the Apostles were holding all three offices of the priesthood, but as the needs of the Church were becoming more and more numerous they were compelled to distinguish between higher and lower duties for those they were ordaining. Hence we have, first the ordinations of the seven deacons, then the ordinations of the presbyters, and last the ordinations of the bishops whom the Holy Ghost by the laying of hands of the Apostles appointed to govern the Church.

St. Paul appoints in this way Titus bishop of the Church of Crete, Timothy bishop of the Church of Ephesus, and he designates them to be his successors in the Apostolic mission. Answering in like manner the needs of the Church, Polycarp is appointed bishop of Smyrna and Ignatius bishop of Antioch, who distinguishing clearly between the three offices of the priesthood insists that without all three offices of priesthood there can be no Church properly understood.

Hence the Greek Orthodox Church has retained the three offices of priesthood. Concerning the bishop's office the Orthodox Church believes as follows: "The office of the bishop is so necessary for the function of the Church that without it no Church can exist or be so called; and no one can be or call himself a Christian without having a bishop. We consider the office of the bishop to be necessary for the Church as breathing is for man and the sun for the world."²⁷

The office of the presbyter is first mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. The author of the Acts of the Apostles relates that St. Paul and Barnabas "when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed."²⁸ The presbyters as ministers of Grace are mentioned also by St. James: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord . . ."²⁹

The extent of the authority of the office of the presbyter is clearly shown in the Acts of the Apostles where the presbyters appear to be in council with the Apostles themselves in matters concerning the very faith of the Church.³⁰ Originally the name

27. Dositheos, "Confession", §q. ι'.

28. Acts, XIV, 21-23

29. James, V, 14

30. Acts, XVI, 4

presbyter used to signify all those ministers of the Gospel whom the Apostles appointed to be their personal representatives and successors. Even the Apostles used to call themselves presbyters. Hence St. Paul ascribes to the presbyters of Ephesus the duties of the bishop as well, whom he instructs to be vigilant over both themselves and the people in the midst of whom the Holy Spirit appointed them to govern the Church of God. In like manner St. Peter writes to the presbyters as being a presbyter himself.³¹ St. John likewise calls himself a presbyter.³²

Gradually, however, the name bishop was retained as the distinctive name of those whom the Apostles appointed as their successors to govern the Church of Christ. St. Paul instructs Titus, for example, to ordain "presbyters" for the needs of the church for which he (Titus) was appointed "bishop".³³

The office of the deacon is often quoted by both Scripture and Tradition. St. Paul instructs Timothy to ordain deacons.³⁴ And, as we have already seen, the Apostles themselves had before that ordained the seven deacons in Jerusalem.

We note in conclusion, that it is undoubtedly evident that the Hierarchy of the Church is clearly distinguished into three offices to which the elect ones of the body of believers are ordained for the purpose of teaching, sanctifying and governing the visible body of the Church.

Further, on the basis of the evidence quoted above, the Hierarchy is established in the Church by the priesthood as its governing body. We believe, therefore, that those contemporary Christian Churches which contend that the priesthood given by the Lord to His Apostles cannot be imparted to others and no longer exists in the Church, are in error. Their belief also that the laying of hands of the Apostles upon those ordained by them does not constitute a sacramental act but a formal act of recognition and appointment appears to be at variance with both Scriptural and Traditional evidence.

Many of these Churches have rejected all the sacraments including the priesthood, on the basis of their own interpretation of certain Biblical passages where all believing in Christ are called "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, priests of God and of Christ". It is obvious, however, that the connotation of these terms is only moral, and does nothing to invalidate the historical truth by which the Hierarchy constituted

31. 1 Peter V,1

32. 1 John I,3

33. Titus, I,5

34. 1 Tim. III,8,12

from the very beginning a distinct sanctifying and governing body which is accepted as such only through priesthood.

No one can deny, of course, that the divine Grace which permeates, as it does, all those believing in Christ renders them "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, etc." But this is true only in a personal way. All believers who by faith become partakers of the redemptive work of our Savior, work each in himself their salvation by the divine Grace they possess, and thus become "beloved of God, and called to be saints."³⁵

As priests, on the other hand, all believers offer their bodies "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service",³⁶ and unite like unto one body with the body of Christ, that is of the Church, as "holy branches from holy root",³⁷ yielding themselves to God "as those that are alive from the dead, and their members as instruments of righteousness unto God."³⁸ In accordance with this concept of universal priesthood, each Christian has to deny to himself thinking of and wishing the world; to die as to sin and perfect himself in the good, becoming "holy and without blame."³⁹

But such a priesthood, as we have said, is a personal matter of faith which is realized in good works and through which each one of us is working out through divine Grace his own salvation. This, however, is far from being identical with the character and essence of the sacrament of priesthood by which the elect ones of the Church receive the call of God and become bearers and *συνεργοί* of the divine Grace, which they impart to others as well for their enlightenment, sanctification and salvation.

Some contemporary theologians, however, believe that no help toward regeneration can be extended to any man, irrespective of the form and character that such help may take, inasmuch as the spiritual power in man has been lost on account of the Fall, making moral perfection an impossibility; regeneration can be only the work of God for certain believers who are predestined by Him for salvation. Needless to say, a theory of salvation as this one destroys the essence and moral content of Christianity and as such is completely unacceptable by us.

It has always been, then, an axiom with the Orthodox Church to regard the Hierarchy as a divinely established institution with three distinct offices. This institution constitutes the founda-

35. Romans I,7. 1 Cor. I,2

36. Romans XII,1

37. Romans XI,16

38. Romans VI,13

39. Eph. I,4

tion upon which the pillars of the Church have been grounded. The Hierarchy, and especially the bishops, represent the Church, that is, the entire body of the bishops and not any one by himself.

There are no major or minor offices of bishop in the Hierarchy of the Church, but all the bishops are equal in relation to each other, all are bearers of the supreme ecclesiastical authority, trustees, and dispensers of the Word and vicars of Christ, in the words of Mogilas, each one in his own particular bishopric, according to Biblical evidence.⁴⁰

Each bishop possesses in his own local church the supreme spiritual authority, and no one of them can or has the right to gather in himself the supreme authority over the whole Church, so as to have the Church living in him and by him alone as by divine right. The ranks of Patriarch, Archbishop and Metropolitan in the Orthodox Church are honorary distinctions, and imply no essential superiority over the rest of the bishops.

According to the teachings of the Orthodox Church the head of each local church is the bishop; above him stands only the authority of the synod of bishops of the greater church to which the local church is a member, and above the local synod the authority of the Universal Church which includes all and each one of the bishops of the Christian Church. The Universal Synod being the instrument of the Holy Spirit is truly infallible in its meditations and decisions. Thus, it is only this Ecumenical Synod that represents the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and it is only its decisions that are binding to both clergy and laity.⁴¹

It is evident, then, that without the sanction of ecumenicity the decisions of no local Church, and more so of a single bishop, can be considered as authoritative and infallible. They may be accepted as true and right insofar as they are grounded upon the precepts of the Orthodox Faith, but they are always subject to the authorization of the next Ecumenical Council. Any other theory opposing this practice tends to destroy the character and significance of Hierarchy, and therefore of the Church itself, which by its bishops examines and discovers the truth under the guidance of the inherent in it Holy Spirit, which alone guides them "to the whole truth."

The Orthodox Church, following on Biblical and Traditional evidence, allows its clergy to marry before ordination. Accord-

40. Question πε'. Acts XX,28

41. Dositheos, ("Ορ. 6.): «τὴν καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀδύνατον ἁμαρτῆσαι ἢ ὀλως πλανηθῆναι ἢ ποτε ψεῦδος ἀντὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκλέξαι. Τὸ γὰρ Πανάγιον Πνεῦμα ἐνεργοῦν διὰ τῶν ποτῶς διακονούντων ἁγίων Πατέρων καὶ καθηγεμόνων πάσης ὁποιασοῦν πλάνης τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀπαλλάττει.»

ing to the 12th Canon of the Sixth General Council of the Church only the bishops must necessarily come from celibate orders, and cannot subsequently marry. No clergyman can marry after he is ordained to any one of the three offices of priesthood.

The Roman Church has, contrary to all Biblical and Traditional evidence, imposed celibacy upon all three offices of the Hierarchy, believing that marriage and the ensuing obligations do not befit priesthood. The Protestants, on the other hand, reacting against the moral license of a certain part of the Roman clergy, allow their bishops to be married and to marry for a second and third time.

The most specific characteristic of the authority of Hierarchy is to remit and bind the sins of men, and to impose penalties upon the repenting ones for their correction and guidance in Christ. This authority was explicitly given by the Lord to His disciples: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."⁴² The Orthodox teaching, accepted also by the Roman Church, recognizes the power and authority to remit sins as an essential pastoral duty.⁴³ The Orthodox Church thinks of penalties, on the other hand, as means of correction and believes that those under penalties are in no way excluded from salvation.

The Church recognizes also the right of the bishops to excommunicate, that is, to exclude wholly from ecclesiastical communion those who fall repeatedly in grave sins. This excommunication can be withdrawn by the bishop who has imposed it or by his successor. Another kind of excommunication is the so-called great excommunication or anathema which only the Church can impose and which entails the complete and irrevocable expulsion of the sinner from the body of the Church.

[Translated from the Greek]

42. Matth. XVIII,18. John XX,22

43. Mogilas, question 98'.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER OF MARRIAGE

**A study of the practice of the Greek Orthodox Church
on the basis of St. Paul's theology of marriage.**

Rev. Dr. Nikon D. Patrinos

The Greek Orthodox Church considers marriage to be one of the seven sacraments of the Church. What follows constitutes an attempt at vindicating the position of the Church and her long practices in regarding marriage as being divinely instituted, and as a bond binding together for life man and woman by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit through the Grace imparted to the parties concerned at the time the marital union is effected.

Judging from the objections that have been advanced against marriage being taken as a sacrament, one may reasonably connect the most important point of theological controversy with the sacramental character of marriage, i.e., whether or not a marital rite imparts the Grace of God to the parties contracting the union. The question resolves, in other words, to whether marriage has been truly founded by the Lord, inasmuch as "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ".¹ And this unavoidably will bring the investigator to the problem of the definition of sacrament.

A sacrament, in the belief of the Church, is a divinely instituted rite which through outward visible signs imparts the

1. John 1,17.

invisible Grace.² Since the element of divine institution is the fundamental clause of the definition of a sacrament, it admits of no other founder of the rite than the Lord Himself.

We know that the Lord Himself founded two sacraments, Baptism and Holy Eucharist, although He instructed nothing in particular as to how those sacraments were to be formulated as ceremonies of His Church. That was left to His Apostles, appointed to be His successors and dispensers of the Grace as ministrants of His sacraments.

Being conscious of the authority they received from the Lord, the Apostles did everything in His name for the purpose of perpetuating through the course of human experience His redemptive work. We find, however, that in addition to those two sacraments the Church from the very beginning held in high esteem and reverence other rites invested with the essential characteristics of a sacrament.³ For these we have no evidence that they were appointed by the Apostles or by the Church. And yet, they constitute an important part of the life of the Church, considered to be instruments of transmission of Grace, indispensable to salvation and tutors to the mysteries of the Kingdom. We have no evidence that the Lord founded them, and yet they possess the authority of the Lord, institutions that put into concrete terms of human reality both the Will and the Gift of the Lord. He did not ask explicitly that they be established as treasuries of His Grace, but both the Apostles and the Church believed so. They ought, in their belief, to be essential parts of the New Life which above all was meant to be a Life of Grace. And the Apostles did nothing without the Lord. On the contrary we have every reason to believe, on the example of St. Paul, that their most earnest concern was to deliver to the Church in their entirety both the letter and the spirit of the sayings of the Lord. One has to conclude, then, on the strength of the beliefs and practice of the Church, that the remaining five sacraments besides Baptism and Eucharist, were truly ordained by the Lord inasmuch as they were accepted and practiced as such by the Apostles and the Church. If the Apostles, and through them the Church, were in error in establishing these five additional rites as imparting the Grace of the Lord, then the Church

2. "Sacraments are divinely instituted ceremonies that impart the invisible Grace through visible signs". Christos Androutsos, *Δογματική* p. 295, 1907. See also K. Diououniotis, *Τὰ Μυστήρια* p. 8, 1913. St. John Chrysostom in his 7 Homily to the I Corinthians: «Μυστήριον καλεῖται, ὅτι οὐχ ἄρα ὁρῶμεν πιστεύομεν, ἀλλ' ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν καὶ ἕτερα πιστεύομεν». Cf. St. Augustine, *Epist.* 55 ad. Jan. and *sermo* 272. Also Metrofanes Critopoulos in his "Confession", chapter 5, in *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Church* by Prof. John Karmiris, vol. II, p. 524 (Athens, 1953). Μυστήριον ἐστὶν ὁρατὸν τι σημεῖον τῆς ἀόρατου χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῆς εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἐγγεομένης, διαταχθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ ἕκαστος τῶν πιστῶν τὴν θείαν χάριν λαμβάνει: Mogilas' *Confession* in Karmiris, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 635.

3. See Diououniotis, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20.

was conceived in human fallibility. Nothing else, consequently, from those that they transmitted as the commands of the Lord could stand the criterion of truth. In theological terms one may contend that whatever is true in regard to the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist must also be true by analogy in regard to the rest of the sacraments.

Historically speaking, we find no evidence in the early Church specifically naming the Lord as the founder of the sacraments.⁴ It is certain, however, that the Fathers were convinced that the Grace of a sacrament emanates from God in general, or from Jesus Christ, or from the Holy Spirit, or from all three persons of the Holy Trinity. The Apostles, and especially St. Paul, were particularly careful to stress the things that were given to the Church κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου as against those that were their own opinions. Of instructions given as commands of the Lord nothing failed to become part of the consciousness of the Church, while individual opinions of the Apostles were often made the objects of discussion. We have no evidence that any-one of the rites we find vested with sacramental authority in the Apostolic Church has ever been the object of dispute. They were all apparently taken to have been introduced in the life of the Church κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου. The Lord, though indirectly, must have been considered to be the founder of those rites.⁵

Marriage, being considered by the Church as one of the rites that the Lord founded mediately through His Apostles, has been treated by theologians, especially after the Reformation, more severely than any other of the five sacraments, apparently because it evolves one of the most important phases of human life. It has been assailed on two grounds: first, that it has not been founded by the Lord; second, that it has not been called a sacrament even by the Apostle who dealt extensively with it, in which case it could be accepted as one of the sacraments which the Church believes to have been indirectly instituted by the Lord.

We shall proceed, then, to indicate, (a) that arguing from the principle of divine reality, taken to be an essential element of sacramental definition, marriage appears to be well-qualified to be considered a divinely instituted rite of the Church, and (b) that this divine institution was definitely made part of the life of the Church by one of the Apostles of Christ, and was accorded the sacramental character which in turn was received by the Church as truly interpreting in Christian terms the union between man and woman, and was transmitted to us unchanged

4. The first historical evidence is found in Pseudo-Ambrose, *De Sacr.*, IV, 4: "quis est auctor sacramentorum nisi Dominus Jesus? De coelo ista sacramenta venerunt." Cf. St. Augustine, *Epist.* 82, 14. 15. 138.

5. Cf. the opinions of Androutsos and Diouvouniotis. Androutsos *op. cit.*, pp. 296-297. Diouvouniotis, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

through the continuum of the consciousness of the Church, called Tradition.

The argument from Reality.

It has been contended that since the Lord did not actually establish marriage as an institution indispensable for salvation, and more so since He did not actually institute the marital ceremony, marriage cannot be considered to have been divinely instituted and so it cannot be considered to be a sacrament.⁶ Consequently, marriage is taken to be an ordinance of God expressed by the fact of creation of mankind in two kinds ever seeking to complement each other, but it cannot be accepted as a Christian sacrament. If there is a sacramental character in marriage that must be identified, it is contended, with the natural attachment of man to woman and vice versa, and with the Church's vesting of the marital union with Grace supposedly imparted to the parties concerned, on the assumption that marriage was actually ordained and instituted by Jesus Christ.

At this point a clear line of demarcation must be drawn between two arguments, the one based upon the opinion that the characteristic *par excellence* of the Christian sacrament is its divine actuality, that is, the fact that a sacrament has been actually ordained and instituted by the Lord, and the other based upon the opinion that a sacrament can equally and fully be a Christian sacrament if divine reality can be proven to be the characteristic *par excellence* of the sacrament in question. The first opinion has been already outlined above, and can be more extensively studied in the writings of some Protestant theologians who can find no unshakable support for accepting marriage as a sacrament.

In discussing the second, we shall unavoidably touch upon the nature of redemption as worked out in experience by Jesus Christ. The redemptive work of the Lord undoubtedly consists of what He Himself said and did for the purpose of reconciling the second Adam with his Creator. In so working the redemp-

6. *The Two Books of Homilies* (Oxford, 1859), pp. 355, 356. See also the *Explanation of the XXXIX Articles* (2nd ed., 1853), by Dr. E. H. Browne, bishop of Winchester, who believes that matrimony may be a sacrament *in some sense*, but it is not a sacrament of the Gospel, "nor is it a means whereby pardon of sins and inward sanctification are conveyed to us by the Spirit of God", p. 582. A more severe attitude against marriage was taken, of course, by Luther (*De Captivitate Babylonica*: in *Opera* (1888), t. vi, p. 550), and by Calvin who argues on similar lines: "It is not enough that marriage should be from God for it to be considered a sacrament; but it is requisite that there should be an external ceremony appointed by God for the purpose of confirming a promise." *Institutiones*, lib. iv, c. 19, n. 34: in *Opera* (Amsterdam, 1667), t. ix, p. 396.

tion of man, the Lord ordained certain rites considered to be necessary for atonement to become effective in man. Everything that the Lord prescribed by His teaching is based on certain facts of life, and above all upon the fact of creation of mankind in two forms, those of man and woman.

The ordinance of God by which man and woman are united together for no other purpose but to fulfil the divine design of creation stood, no doubt, for the Lord not only as a reality of life but as God's Will actually effected in time. That the Lord accepted marriage as a state of human life actually established by His Father, is clearly shown by the controversy He had with the Pharisees in regard to marriage (Matthew XIX, 4-12). There He re-instated marriage to the status it had of old, before Moses allowed the God's ordinance regarding the indissolubility of marriage to be modified διὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν of the Jews. The rules He lays down in regard to divorce are stated with the authority of His being One with His Father (ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἓν ἐσμεν). He leaves no doubt in one's mind that marriage is not a state of life that belongs to the second Adam but a fact of creation, modified as it has been by man's pride expressed in his constant strife to arrange his life in a self-centered way contrary to God's original ordinance concerning marriage. Consequently, the Lord restates the fact of actuality on the part of His Father in regard to marriage by laying down the rules of living together under God's command. Marriage remains, thus, for the Lord a sacrament of God in which the element of actuality is its most striking characteristic.

The next opportunity that the Lord had to deal with marriage is connected with two facts: His presence at the wedding at Cana, and the working there of His first miracle during the nuptial festivities.⁷ Those two facts did not happen, undoubtedly, by chance, even if one is reluctant to accept that the Lord has actually instituted the sacrament of marriage by His presence and His miracle at the wedding at Cana of Galilee. The Lord's decision to share the event of the wedding at Cana can be taken not only as an unmistakable sign of the importance and sacred character of marriage, as understood and commanded by Him in His discourse with the Pharisees, but as a sign of His sanctifying the marital union by His presence and thus making it a binding ordinance of the new Covenant as well. Characteristic

7. "A wedding was celebrated at Cana of Galilee in visible reality, and water truly became wine. And He was invited for two reasons, viz., that through marriage He might correct the license of passionate man in this world to restraint and gravity, and that for the future He might amend their ways, bringing them to the sweetness of refreshing wine and of grace." St. Epiphanius, *Adv. Haereses, Haer.* 51, c. 30 (C.B.2. 203).

also of the importance of marriage in human life⁸ is the fact that the Lord selected an opportunity as the marital ceremony to reveal Himself as possessing supernatural powers which for the first time became manifest and were put to the service of man for the purpose of his salvation.

And yet, despite the fact that the Lord re-iterated marriage as being God's sacrament, He did not Himself seal it as being His own personal ordinance like He did with the two sacraments of the new law. The Church, however, received marriage as a sacrament apparently on the ground that its sacramental character is due to the consideration that the Lord accorded to marriage and not to the fact that He commanded it as a sacrament. Here we have what I call reality as against actuality. The Lord did not actually found marriage as a sacrament in the way He founded Baptism and Eucharist. Yet the Church interpreted the Lord's attitude towards marriage as being undoubtedly sacramental. Marriage is the Lord's sacrament in reality though not in actuality. Marriage and the Lord could not, apparently, be connected by the Church in any other way. St. Paul gives his reasons, as we shall see, and the Church accepted his interpretation as being given κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου. If the Church erred in misunderstanding the Lord's attitude towards marriage, she must have erred in relation to other points of faith and practice. And no Christian would be prepared to admit this to be true.

The Church had her own way in defining the components of Christian life and in according to each one of them the proper degree of sacredness. She can offer little in support of the idea that marriage was actually established by the Lord as a sacrament.⁹ We have, on the other hand, unmistakable evidence that the rite of marriage has been a very early practice of the

8. "For it was fitting that He Who had come to renew human nature itself and to restore it to a nobler condition, should bestow a blessing not only on those who had already been called into being, but should prepare grace for those who should afterwards be born, and should make their path to existence holy." St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comment. in Joan.*, lib. ii, c. 2 (PG 73. 223).

9. "As for the time when Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage, we know nothing. Many of the ancient writers and some of the later ones think that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage either during the wedding at Cana (John, 2,1), or during His controversy with the Pharisees (Matthew 19, 4-6); neither alternative is acceptable because we have no Biblical evidence to that effect. It may be that the most probable solution is that Christ instituted the sacrament of marriage sometime between His resurrection and His ascension." K. Diouvouniotis, *Tὰ Μυστήρια*, pp. 173-4.

Church,¹⁰ marriage being conceived anew as a bond for life between two Christians. The emphasis, thus, has been shifted from marriage being a God's sacrament to marriage being a Lord's sacrament as well.

It would be difficult to understand such a shifting of emphasis unless we accept St. Paul's theology of marriage as being a harmonious sequence of what the Lord Himself had laid down as the essence of marriage. The missing link of actuality must have been taken by St. Paul and the rest of the Church as an implied fact, beyond the necessity of being specifically supplied by the Lord.

The Lord dealt with marriage twice and in a manner both clear and precise. In the first instance, when discoursing with the Pharisees, He re-invested marriage with the supreme authority of His Father's command and laid down at the same time its essentials without which marriage cannot exist. In the second instance, at the wedding at Cana, the Lord, in perfect sequence with His authorizing marriage as His Father's command, seals the union with His own sanctification, rendering it doubly sacred and making it part of His doings. Thus, the missing element of actuality is amply supplied by what the Lord said and did in connection with marriage.

A different interpretation of the Lord's attitude towards marriage would lead us to two untenable conclusions: either that the Lord would not make His Father's Will His own, or that He would not allow the Spirit to empower the command of His Father which is His Command as well. The first alternative would destroy the very divinity of Jesus and His identity with the Father; the second would invalidate His promise that He would

10. "It is fitting that those who enter on marriage should form that union with the approval of the bishop, that the marriage should be according to the Lord and not according to the desires of the flesh." St. Ignatius in his letter to St. Polycarp. *Ep. ad. Polyc.*, n. 3. "For if the blessing which the priest gives to the woman who is about to enter conjugal life be violated by a breach (of her vow), the faithful regard her act as a sacrilege." St. Ciriacus, *Ep. ad. Himerium*, c. 4. (P.L. 13. 1136). St. Ambrose is emphatic in requiring that the Christian marriage "be sanctified by the priestly veil and benediction". *Ep. 19, ad Vigil.* (P.L. 16. 985). "Where shall we find power to declare the happiness of that marriage, which the Church arranges, which the oblation confirms, the benediction seals, the angels proclaim, which the Father ratifies?" Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem*, lib. ii, c. 9 (P.L. 1. 1302). Καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ συνζεύξας τὰ δύο εἰς ἓν, ἵνα μηκέτι ᾖσι δύο παρ' οὗ ἀρμόζεται ἀνδρὶ γυνή. καὶ ἐπεὶ ὁ Θεὸς συνζεύξε, διὰ τοῦτο χάρισμα ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ Θεοῦ συνευγμένους . . . Origen, *Comment. in Matt.*, t. xiv, c. 16. 'Ο τῆς φύσεως δεσμός, ὁ διὰ τῆς εὐλογίας ζυγός (τοῦ γάμου) ἔνωσις ἔσται ζῶν δεστώτων. St. Basil the Great, (εἰς τὴν ἐξαίμ. ὁμιλ. 7,5). Καθαρὸς εἰ μετὰ τὸν γάμον, ἐμὸς κίνδυνος, ἐγὼ τοῦτου συναρμωστής, ἐγὼ νυμφοστόλος. St. Gregory the Theologian, *On baptism*, 18. 'Αγίου ὄντος τοῦ νόμου ἅγιος ὁ γάμος· τὸ μυστήριον τοίνυν τοῦτο εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἄγει ὁ ἀπόστολος. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3,12.

have the Spirit working with His believers in the perpetuation of His redemptive work. The Church has mediately rejected both of these negations by accepting the viewpoint of St. Paul, who grades marriage as nothing less but an ὑποτύπωσις of the union between Jesus and His Church.

St. Paul's theology of marriage.

St. Paul has dealt rather extensively with the nature of marital union and the problems it entails on both the personal and the Christian-community levels. His theology of marriage, however, can be clearly traced in his Epistle to the Ephesians (v, 22-32). Much has been said as to what St. Paul means in these few passages in regard to marriage being divinely instituted. It seems that the prevalent interpretation is that though St. Paul speaks of marriage as a Christian institution, which is raised by him to the level of the mystical union between Christ and His Church, he neither calls it a sacrament nor gives any evidence that marriage was actually instituted by the Lord and was meant to convey the Grace to the parties concerned.¹¹ As,

11. Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. St. Jerome translated: *Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia*, i.e. the mystery here is great, I mean in reference to Christ and the Church. The point of controversy among interpreters has been from the very beginning connected with St. Paul's statement—the mystery here is great. Does this refer to the mystical union of Christ and the Church, in which case it should be connected with verse 27 or should it remain as it is? Modern scholarship contends that what St. Paul had in mind is the mystical union of Christ and the Church and so—the mystery here is great—belongs to the end of verse 27 by reason of logical coherence. This is obvious, it is contended, by the explanation that St. Paul offers further in an attempt to replace his statement to its proper context—I mean in reference to Christ and the Church. Ancient commentators could not all be convinced with the arguments of modern scholarship. They rather took the statement to refer to marriage on the human level, but not to marriage as practiced of old; to marriage between two Christians. St. Paul was writing to Christians and was trying to explain marriage on a new basis which bore close connection with marriage as instituted by God but not as practiced by men. His attempt undoubtedly was to reconstruct the marital union on the pattern of a mystical union in which the uniting parties were none other but Christ and the Church. His demands upon the Christians that they offer exactly to the union what Christ did, could have no bearing at all unless the old law of marriage was made to fit exactly the pattern of the new. Marriage as presented by the old law was truly a mystery of life and a sacred situation of life inasmuch as it was commanded by God. It was really the sacrament of God which was destined to govern the very existence of the human race. As such it was a "great mystery" which St. Paul believes became greater and more sacred by its becoming a way of life of the Christians. As such it ought to be fulfilled on the pattern of the new law, and that could be done by being identified with the most complete spiritual union that a man ever knew, that between Christ and the Church. The Church of the first centuries understood St. Paul as meaning to invest the essence of the old law with the promise of the new. "Holy is the law, holy is marriage; this mystery is ascribed therefore by the Apostle unto Christ and the

however, no conclusive proof has been produced as to the theological implications of St. Paul's treatment of marriage, one feels that an attempt at re-interpreting his thought would prove of some use.

St. Paul's treatise on marriage is no different in nature from modern marriage counseling, where marital problems involving personal relationships are defined and discussed in reference to a standard of life. The standard of reference that St. Paul employs here is of a unique nature. He, for the first time in the history of marriage, introduces the spiritual part of marriage as an essential part of the marital contract, in fact as the most important element of marital conjugation.

In dealing with practical adjustments on the part of both parties, necessary for the attainment of the happiness inherent in living together, St. Paul shifts the emphasis of conjugation from the personal subjectivity of husband and wife to the impersonal objectivity of the spiritual element in marriage, on the pattern of a union of another kind which human marriage should ever strive to be identified with.

However, the burden laid upon the parties of the marital

Church" says St. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 3,12). The interpretation of the rest of the Church has been no different until the Reformation period. If we accept, however, that St. Paul refers to the marriage of old as being a great mystery which is brought into line and identified with its prototype, the spiritual union between Christ and the Church, the second part of his statement—*ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*—cannot be interpreted by—I mean in reference to Christ and the Church. Expressions like *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω* can hardly be accepted as meaning—I mean. The Latin translation is a word-by-word rendering which does not give the meaning of the expression. The pronoun *ἐγὼ* and the antithetic *δὲ* are too strong to be dismissed with the English "I". A closer to the true meaning rendering would probably be: "I myself say in addition that . . .". The word *δὲ* is obviously not a connecting word but is put there to signify an emphasis, an additional element that the author wants his following clause to have. The meaning of the preposition *εἰς* is doubtful as it is interpreted. I have no doubt that *εἰς* means something more than "in reference". If my interpretation of *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω* is correct, then *εἰς* must mean not "in reference" but "in identification". If St. Paul were speaking out his thoughts on marriage they would never be so fragmentary. But still his context is very clear as an attempt to transform, so to say, the old marriage into a union of the essence of the mystical bond between Christ and the Church. The closest paraphrase of this much discussed passage would probably convey the meaning as follows: this mystery (marriage on the human level) is great; I myself say in addition that it is in identification with the union of Christ and the Church. This interpretation appears to follow closely upon the beliefs of the Fathers, and be more in line with the practice of the Church, by which marriage was taken to be a sacrament on the very strength of St. Paul's discussion on marriage. Summarizing St. Paul's argument we see that he apparently took marriage as sacred on the strength of its having been instituted by God, and sacramental on the strength of having been Christianized by its identification with the union of Christ and the Church.

union outweighs the biological ends of marriage, the union now having to deal more with two souls than with two bodies despite the fact that the marital union continues to be outwardly effected by the union of the bodies. The archetype of St. Paul's marriage which is the mystical union between Christ and His Church, proves to be beyond the attainment of husband and wife unless they are externally fortified with some help which would provide for their deficiencies. And yet St. Paul's marital pattern, despite its being difficult or even impossible to realize in experience, has persisted since then as the true end of marriage; first, because people have realized the futility of marriage based on the personal subjective level, and second, because of the conviction of man that such an experience as marriage, upon which both the body and soul of mankind depend, must be inherently endowed with the positive and effective help of God who ordained it.

It may be that very few would now-a-days object to the fact that the greater part of marital conjugation is spiritual, or that marriage gets its sustaining power from beyond the reach of the two personalities in marital relationship. But what appears to be almost the norm of marital striving now was not apparent or even presented then, before St. Paul conceived marriage on the spiritual level, that is, before St. Paul effected the Christianization of marriage.

In turning marital conjugation into the Christian bond between man and woman, St. Paul yields to us valuable evidence as to the nature of marriage ἐν Κυρίῳ. The substance of marriage, according to St. Paul's conception of the marital union, must consist of all the parts inherent in the mystical union between Christ and His Church. Above all, the love of the husband for the wife must become the same boundless ocean of offering one's own self as the Lord offered His life for His Church.¹² The wife must discover her own true self in her husband's love for her, and she can only do this by becoming part of his personality, like the Church can live only in Christ.¹³ This kind of submission on the part of the wife purports to uproot discordant behavior between a member of the body and the head, to achieve the oneness that man lost at the moment of his Fall.

All in all, the marital bondage and the implied relationships must become identical with their prototype, the mystical union between Christ and His Church. This union is called a "sublime mystery" by St. Paul, and it is this sublime mystery that the parties to a marital contract are required to identify themselves with.

12. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself up for her sake . . . (Ephesians 5,25).

13. Wives (be subject) to your husbands as to the Lord . . . (*ibid.* 22).

While speaking of the union of Christ with His mystical bride, St. Paul states that the love that Christ has for His Church was so great that He gave Himself up for her sake "that he might sanctify her . . ."¹⁴ And it is this sanctification through the blood of Christ that constitutes the summit of the sublime mystery. From that moment on all unions made in the Lord (ἐν Κυρίῳ) are partaking of the same sanctification in which the Church was cleansed at the time the life of the Lord was offered for her sake.

But a marital union can never be contracted ἐν Κυρίῳ unless it is drawn upon the archetype of true marriage, which is the mystical union between the Lord and the Church. The most important feature of the archetype as presented by St. Paul is the sanctification of the union through the offering of the life of the Groom for His bride. The sanctification must become part of the marital union on the human level, or else the union is not on the pattern and does not partake of the essence of the heavenly union called the "sublime mystery". No man on his own could ever effect such a sanctification of his marital union, for the pattern of the heavenly marriage appears to be so remote from and so unconnected with the findings and lessons of human experience.

And St. Paul, above anybody else, knew how remote and unattainable such a union would appear to his correspondents at Ephesus, whose marriages were connected with problems and situations bearing no resemblance at all with any supernatural realities. St. Paul himself was the son of Grace, and knew that man by himself can do very little. It is very unlikely, then, that St. Paul could ever expect his correspondents to take seriously his admonitions for loving their wives as the Lord loved the Church, unless he was implying the Grace which would make the weak strong, and would guide the vessel of marriage safely through the adversities of experience.

If the sanctification of the mystical union on the supernatural level is not imparted to the parties of the marital union on the human level, then the pattern proposed by St. Paul as the prototype of marriage cannot be followed and can have no binding force upon humanity.

And yet St. Paul does not mention specifically anything about the Grace of the Lord being imparted to man and woman when they bind themselves together in wedlock. Apparently he did not need to mention it. The pictures he has drawn the two marriages, his whole-hearted conviction that marriage can never be stable and worth living unless it becomes like its archetype,

14. Ephesians, 5, 26.

convinces his readers that what St. Paul is speaking of is not a *παράνεσις* to his readers to do their best to live in their marriages the supernatural union, but a clear-cut doctrine by which the Christian marriage is not only a divine ordinance but a reality full of Grace, above all, because it relives in experience the divine pattern of the heavenly union.

St. Paul's conviction, further, that the Christian marriage cannot fulfil its ends unless it becomes identified with the mystical union between Christ and His Church, and cannot be called Christian unless it is based upon that archetype, shows beyond doubt that Christ must be a part to it in a tangible reality. Hence the Pauline conception of marriage *ἐν Κυρίῳ* mentioned in his First Epistle to the Corinthians¹⁵ and also in his Epistle to the Colossians.¹⁶

In order for the marital union to be effected *ἐν Κυρίῳ* marriage must fall within the jurisdiction of the Lord's Church, through which He bestows the Grace of the Spirit to the parties in question. Sanctification of the union on the human level, so that it may become like its archetype, presupposes the imparting of divine Grace as the most essential characteristic of a marriage in the Lord. Dispensers of divine Grace are by the Lord's command those who were entrusted by Him with continuing His redemptive work in human experience. The Church appears to be the treasury of such Grace and the Apostles and their successors its dispensers.

It is further explained and reassured by St. Paul, through the stressing of the spiritual aspect of marriage which in Christ and His Church finds its complete fulfilment, that marriage is a bond linking together for life three parties, implicitly known before but explicitly stated now: man, woman and the Grace of the Spirit. A three-party contract as this, requires to be drawn and effected by outward signs performed by an authorized agency of the Lord, that is, by His Church. The intention of the two parties to effect the marital union *ἐν Κυρίῳ* further requires the presence of the third party, of the Spirit, so that the union may be truly effected. The presence of the Spirit and the imparting of the Grace are effected by the execution of the intention of the two parties by means of a certain ritual that bears both *τὴν γνώμην καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν* of the Church.

It is in this context, I believe, that the Church understood St. Paul's theology of marriage, and sought to practice it by insisting that marriage is a sacrament by which the divine Grace

15. . . . but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. (I Cor., 7,39).

16. Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. (Col., iii, 18).

is imparted to the marital parties through and during the rite that she ordained for its celebration.

The fact that a number of marriages were contracted outside the Church must be taken as discrepancies and not as evidence that the sacramental character of marriage was thought by the Church to lie with the intention of the parties concerned, as if the two parties were really the dispensers of the Grace themselves. In all the sacraments the one who dispenses the Grace is the Church through the priest, and though the intention of the parties is necessary for the Grace to be dispensed in marriage, we cannot say that the marital union is effected as a sacrament merely because the parties concerned agreed to it and proceeded to live together.¹⁷

A theology of marriage which empowers the two parties to be able to invoke and dispense to themselves the Grace, as the Roman Catholic Church teaches, destroys the very conception of the Church as the treasury of Grace and the clergy as her executors. If the same interpretation is given to the other sacraments as well, then priesthood and the Church as divinely established institutions are dispensed with completely. This is against the theological thought and doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church which, nevertheless, in her strife to extend her control over marriages contracted by civil law, decreed that even those marriages must come under the jurisdiction of the Church inasmuch as they were true sacraments. Needless to say, that the pursuit of a theory by which the marital parties can dispense the Grace to themselves, empowers civil law marriages with the same doctrinal value that the ones performed by the Church possess. Why, then, should people seek to seal their marital intention with the rite of the Church is not explained. Is the religious part of the marriage a mere social event, or even an opportunity for receiving the Church's blessing, as believed by some?

Indissolubility of Marriage.

If marriage is a sacrament it cannot be dissolved at will. The Lord has been very emphatic in prohibiting divorce except for adultery.¹⁸ The very nature also of the sacraments as such admits of no revoke of the Grace at the will of the parties concerned. If God is with the parties of marriage, He is with them at their invocation but on His Will also. There are three

17. See note 10. K. Diovoniotis, *Tà Μυστήρια*, p. 177. Also Christos Androutsos, *Δογματική*, pp. 398-99.

18. Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, commiteth adultery. (Matthew 19,9).

parties to be consulted on a divorce: husband, wife and marriage itself; that is, the union ἐν Κνολῳ which has become an entity and an authority in itself. It is what in common language is called "my marriage"; something separate and above me that holds me and the other party together not only because we want to be held together but because the Grace of marriage holds us together. In divorce we really have two offenders against one. Both of the marital parties are guilty against the Spirit, in so far as they sought the Spirit to be their partner and their sustainer in the labors of marital vicissitudes.

The Lord has prescribed that whenever adultery is the intervening factor in marital relationships, the suffering party could ask for divorce. Infidelity destroys the essence of the visible union of marriage. One body, one soul, is the foundation of marriage. The mental and bodily desire of the marital parties must be one and indivisible. It must lay its object within itself, it must desire its own united body. Once the desire places its object outside the united body of the wedded, it has forfeited its essence to adultery. Division in mental desire is not mentioned by the Lord since there can be no bodily desire without its preceding counterpart in the mental state of desiring.

Death also dissolves marriage and leaves free the surviving partner to contract a new marriage. St. Paul preferred chastity instead of the second marriage, while the Fathers allowed the second marriage as a concession to human weakness and frailty, and very seldom acquiesced to a third one which they considered to be a defilement of the body. And if the second marriage was for the Fathers a sign of lack of Christian virtue, the fourth one, completely prohibited, was labeled polygamy.¹⁹

In concluding this brief study of the sacramental character of marriage, one must note how the continuum of the consciousness of the Church, called Tradition, has enlightened and interpreted in more than one occasion the spirit and letter of Biblical evidence on points important for both faith and practice. There is not even one of those who have recorded this authoritative body of interpretation that has doubted for a moment that marriage is truly a sacrament bearing all the unmistakable signs of authenticity and authority.

Marriage was considered to be a sacrament long before the Fathers put together the definition of a sacrament. And, undoubtedly, the definition was made to fit all those practices of the Church which were held in supreme reverence as acts of

19. "The Church concedes the second and third marriages; the fourth is not allowed. Even the second and third must be excused on the ground of some good cause . . ." Critopoulos, *Confession*, chapter 12, in Karmiris, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 543.

the Spirit purporting to strengthen the believers in their strife for identification with the One.

Strange but not surprising is the evidence that comes from modern psychological studies in regard to both the substance and essence of the marital conjugation. The psychology of marriage appears to be a psychology completely sacramental, in which the third party of the union reigns supreme above and over the personal authority of husband and wife. Breaking of the marital contract is inevitable at the moment husband and wife forsake the third authority in marriage, the Grace, as a protector, and arbitrator.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOHN KARMIRIS, *The Dogmatic and Symbolic Texts of the Orthodox Catholic Church*. Vol. I, Athens, 1952; pp. 1-432. Vol. II, Athens, 1953; pp. 433-1067.

In these two volumes Dr. J. N. Karmiris, a professor of theology at the University of Athens and Royal Delegate to the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece, with assiduous and scholarly effort has published the Creeds and Confessions of the Orthodox Catholic Church, which, being more or less authentic declarations of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, set forth the Orthodox doctrinal faith, the religious feeling and dogmatic continuum of Orthodoxy.

The need for this truly monumental work was extremely pressing, especially to students of Orthodox theology, and its publication timely in view of the fact that for some time now there has been a growing interest in the faith and practices of the Orthodox Catholic Church on the part of non-Orthodox scholars and even laymen. This work constitutes the first complete collection of dogmatico-symbolical statements of the Orthodox Church from the time of the Oecumenical Councils to the present day, and as such is an expression of the living tradition of the Orthodox Church. Previous editions of the so-called Symbolic Books of the Orthodox Church, i.e., by E. Kimmel, *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*, (Jenae, 1850); J. Mesoloras, *Συμβολική τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. I. *Τὰ Συμβολικά Βιβλία*, Athens, 1883, and J. Michalcescu, *Θησαυρός τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας*, (Leipzig, 1904) are not only difficult to find but also incomplete.

The editor in his introduction, Prolegomena pp. 17-33, discusses the meaning, authority, number and titles of the dogmatico-symbolical documents of the Orthodox Church. He clearly draws the distinction between the Symbols of the Church (Creeds) and the symbolic books or texts, and classifies the numerous documents into three categories: (a) Creeds, dogmatic definitions and decisions of the seven Oecumenical Councils which have absolute and enduring authority, including the decisions of Local Synods incorporated into the decisions of the Oecumenical Councils, as well as the Divine Liturgy; (b) symbolic statements of Local Synods, Confessions of Patriarchs and Encyclicals; these have only relative authority being statements of faith issued since the time of the Schism as expositions of Orthodox doctrine and being occasioned in whole or in part by the Church's opposition to other religious bodies; (c) the symbolic statements of post-Byzantine and contemporary times which are of secondary value in considering the sources of Orthodox doctrine. The writer emphatically points out that the only absolutely authoritative expositions of faith are those which have the seal of ecumenicity, and these are the statements and decisions of the Oecumenical Councils. All other declarative writings have relative authority and are not properly to be understood as Confessions in the Western sense of the term, but only as partial expositions of Orthodox faith intending to express the spirit of Orthodoxy at the time of their writing and to give evidence of the unbroken continuity of faith throughout the ages.

Of special value are the editor's historical and critical notes on all the texts published. There is a good bibliography on each text which is both extensive and up-to-date. The first part of the book, pp. 34-100, is devoted to the three Oecumenical Symbols (Creeds): (a) the Apostles' Creed or *Symbolum Apostolicum*, which though not of Apostolic origin, the editor (p. 18) feels ought to be included in the collection of Orthodox symbolic

statements for the reason that it expresses the basic teachings of the Church and because it has served as an early baptismal Confession to which the whole Church has subscribed, having served as a basis for the development of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed; (b) the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, and (c) the Athanasian Creed, which the author thinks ought to be considered one of the Symbols of the Orthodox Church, although it was not written by St. Athanasius nor used in the East until the 12th century, and then only by Latin clergymen. This Creed was never officially accepted by the Orthodox Church (Council of Ferrara), but according to the author it does correctly state the Trinitarian and Christological teaching of the Church—with the exception, of course, of the “filioque” and any allusions to it. Professor Karmiris abides by the decision of the Patriarchal Committee of Constantinople which in 1900 permitted the publication of this Creed in the *Mega Horologion* of the Church on the basis that it agrees with the fundamental teachings of the Orthodox Church (note p. 19).

The second part of this two-volume work, pp.110-229, contains the credal formulations and dogmatic decisions and Canons of the ancient Oecumenical Councils, those of Local Synods and Church Fathers such as Sts. Athanasius, Basil the Great, Timothy of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius of Iconium and Theophilus of Alexandria.

The third part, pp. 242-264, contains the Divine Liturgy of the Orthodox Church ascribed to St. John Chrysostom. This seems to be the first time that the Liturgy has been classified among the symbolic texts of the Orthodox Church. Prof. Karmiris is of the opinion that this important document ought to be included in the collection not only because it is of great importance for the devotional life of the Church, but because it is also rich in doctrinal content. As such, it is a living expression of the dogmatic faith of the Orthodox Church.

The fourth part is a collection of 24 different documents which date from the Encyclical of Patriarch Photius to the Patriarchs of the East in 866 down to the present time, including the various statements made by Orthodox delegations to the inter-Church Conferences of Lausanne, Edinburgh and Lund. These statements have only relative authority within the Orthodox Church; they express only in part the faith of the Orthodox Church and do not constitute official Confessions of the Church.

In the appendix, pp. 912-1050, the author discusses the practice of the Church in accepting non-Orthodox to her fold, the validity of sacraments performed outside the Church and Inter-communion. In this section one finds important material pertaining to the practice of the Church in admitting Roman Catholics, Monophysites, and Protestants; statements with regard to the validity of Anglican Orders; and decisions of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches on the admission of Chiliasts, Jews and Moslems to the Church. Of course, these decisions are not to be regarded as having absolute and enduring authority. At most, they are indications of the present emphasis of Orthodox doctrine and practice in the face of contemporary problems. They do serve, however, as a preparatory stage for the final discussion and decision on these questions, to be accomplished only with the convocation of the much-hoped-for Eighth Oecumenical Council.

The editor has worked diligently and untiringly in preparing and editing this remarkable piece of work. He has been motivated by a sincere desire to bring to the attention of both Orthodox and non-Orthodox the treasures of Orthodox thought and practice in the hope that through this, all may gain a deeper insight and better appreciation of the spirit of Orthodoxy.

As one reads through the priceless credal statements of the Orthodox Church, he cannot help but experience and feel a oneness with the ageless spirit of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Nothing has been omitted which could contribute to a fuller knowledge and justification of the faith held by all Orthodox Churches—that they are one, bound in faith and love to the Church of Christ. At a time when the various Churches are earnestly searching for the *Una Sancta*, we believe that a thorough knowledge

of the doctrine, practice and spirit of the Orthodox Church cannot but help to terminate this fruitless search.

These two volumes are dedicated to the Orthodox Church of Greece, one of the many federated autocephalous Churches of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, on the occasion of the 1900th anniversary of her founding by St. Paul, the Apostle to the gentiles. The editor is a professor at the University of Athens, Greece; no better dedication could have been made by an author and scholar steeped in the tradition of his Church.

Z. C. Xintaras

UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, *Annual Theological Review*, Vol I, Salonica, Greece. Pp. 537. Paper. (in Greek)

The 537 pages of the *Annual Theological Review* published by the School of Divinity of the University of Salonika, Greece are neatly packed with material covering almost all branches of theological thought and investigation. Contributions vary in scholarly effort and achievement, as it is the case with all kinds of *symposia*. Contributors are all members of the Faculty, and their articles clearly reflect both the caliber of the instructors of the Divinity School at Salonica and their efforts to present the School as a centre not only of teaching but of research as well. The Divinity School at Salonica is the second center of theological learning in Greece besides the much older Divinity School of the University of Athens. Despite its age, however, the School has been staffed with able teachers, some of whom have been promoted since the publication of this volume to the Divinity School of the University of Athens. The reader of this *Review* must rest assured that the time he is going to spend in reading through its 537 pages would not be wasted.

The first contribution comes from the pen of Dr. D. Moraites and is entitled "An Introduction to Liturgics and to Liturgical Studies", pp. 3-41. Dr. Moraites offers his material in the text-book form and style though he does not limit himself with material intended for beginners in the study of Liturgiology. His bibliography, references and quotations are scholarly and have clearly in mind the serious student of contemporary Liturgiological movements. His contribution is very timely on account of the recently aroused interest in the comparative study of the liturgical forms and practices of the East and West. The author has spent most of his space, as expected, in dealing with studies of Greek Orthodox liturgics dating from the 4th century to the present time. By that he offers a positive contribution to the study of liturgics on both sides of the fence.

Dr. C. Bonis, professor now at the University of Athens, writes on "Archbishop Eustathius of Thessaloniki", pp. 45-88, a picturesque Byzantine prelate of the 12th century. An ecclesiastical leader, a theologian, an orator and a reformer of monastic life, Eustathius played an important role in the ecclesiastical and theological developments of the middle Byzantine period. His life and works are treated by Dr. Bonis with a remarkable understanding of Eustathius' complex personality and of conditions which have influenced the theologico-political movements of his time.

"The Ending of the Bulgarian Schism", pp. 91-196, is a treatise written by Prof. G. Konidaris, now of the University of Athens, in which he deals with issues of a more general nature, like the relationships between Church and State, the spread of Christianity to the Slavs, and the later Pan-Slavic movement. For the first time since the reconciliation of the Bulgarian Church with that of Constantinople, the causes of the Schism are thoroughly investigated and a complete historical outline is given of events both preceding and following the Schism. Dr. Konidaris, without underestimating other contiguous factors, believes that the Bulgarian Schism was mostly the result of nationalistic antitheses and political movements (p. 125). He agrees that the Ecumenical Patriarchate acted wisely in accepting the application of the Bulgarian Church to be re-admitted to full status within the

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

Volume I

March, 1955

Number 2



**Greek Orthodox Theological Institute Press
Brookline, Massachusetts**

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME I**MARCH, 1955****NUMBER 2**

CONTENTS

Declaration of the Orthodox Delegates at Evanston concerning the main theme of the Assembly	93
Declaration concerning Faith and Order	96
An Important Communication on the Schism BISHOP ATHENAGORAS	99
The Sacramental Character of Marriage REV. DR. NICON D. PATRINACOS	118
Gregory of Nyssa on the Nature of the Soul JOHN P. CAVARNOS	133
On the Hierarchy of the Church REV. JOHN PAPADOPOULOS	142
Concerning Inner Attention CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS	152
The Division of Christendom and Possibilities of Reunion JOHN N. KARMIRIS	160
Correspondence	176
Book Reviews REV. Z. C. XINTARAS	178
N. D. P., G. S. B. CONSTANTINE CAVARNOS	
List of Orthodox Theological Publications REV. DEAN TIMOTHY ANDREWS	183
Contributors	185

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review is devoted to Greek Orthodox theological thought. Manuscripts should not exceed 7,500 words, and should be accompanied by an addressed envelope. Footnotes and references should appear on separate pages; all of these, as well as the text, should be typed double-spaced throughout, in all manuscripts submitted.

Editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor: Rev. Dr. Nikon D. Patrinos, 50 Goddard Ave., Brookline 46, Mass.

Book Reviews should be sent to the Book Review Editor: Rev. Zachary C. Xintaras, 50 Goddard Ave., Brookline 46, Mass.

Editorial Representative in Europe: Professor John Karmiris, Divinity School, Athens University, Athens, Greece.

Reprints. Fifty free offprints are given to contributors of articles, notes and special reviews. Five copies of the *Review* are supplied gratis to the authors of book reviews.

Business communications should be addressed to *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 50 Goddard Ave., Brookline 46, Mass.

Annual Subscription, \$6.00

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE PRESS
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline 46, Massachusetts

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

SIR:

All those responsible for the progress of our Church and the mission of Orthodoxy in this Country are sincerely appreciative of the first issue of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW. Being conscious in the past of the absence of the Orthodox witness from the contemporary theological thought and Christian practice of America, we welcome the REVIEW as a positive contribution on the part of the Orthodox Church towards offering to our non-Orthodox brethren the treasures of a faith and practice second to none, we believe. May I note that your REVIEW has been duly credited to the foresight and leadership of Archbishop Michael, who has done everything possible to see that this publication continues uninterrupted its important mission?

Orthodox theologians have contributed in the past their share by books or articles, written either originally in English or translated from the Greek or Slavonic languages, and several theological magazines saw the light at times without proving able to survive the vicissitudes of publication and circulation. Religious journals are abundantly circulating at present among our people, endeavoring, most of them very competently, to enlighten and help our members to live the Orthodox faith. Our non-Orthodox brethren in this Country know little or nothing, however, of the beliefs, practice and Church organization of Christian Orthodoxy. Even our own Orthodox Youth finds itself at a loss whenever the doctrines and the historical background of their Church are discussed, especially by exponents of other faiths.

Not very long ago, Orthodox Bishops in this Country were called to a meeting by Archbishop Athenagoras, the present Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and leader of international Orthodoxy, for the purpose of affording an opportunity to every one in this Country to know and understand the Orthodox thought and life. One of the outcomes of this meeting was the decision to start publishing the PAN-ORTHODOX REVIEW, a theological periodical at the service of all Orthodox ecclesiastical jurisdictions of this Country. This brought together several representatives from each ecclesiastical jurisdiction commissioned by their leaders to see that their plan was realized. Articles were contributed and discussed but the publication of the REVIEW had to wait on account of financial difficulties. Meanwhile the Russian Orthodox Seminary of St. Vladimir began publishing its QUARTERLY on the pattern decided upon for the PAN-ORTHODOX REVIEW. Your own REVIEW, following on the plan set out by Patriarch Athenagoras, shows once more that a magazine discussing and explaining Orthodox theology and Church practices was a necessity that could not wait any more.

Christian Orthodoxy, incorporating as it does the totality of Christ's revelation, has much to offer by way of books, articles and magazines, for the purpose of imparting the most rich Christian tradition of all. As it is, the fulness of Orthodox tradition is known only to a few, while the beauty of its symbolism can be enjoyed by those alone who have had the opportunity to make it part of their religious lives. The heights and depths of Orthodox theology can be reached only by those who know Greek, and make it their business to occupy themselves with theological and philosophical questions. Just as inaccessible to the average Christian is the rich-

ness and symbolism of the Orthodox ritual and generally the whole essence of the Orthodox devotional life of our Church. The communion with God and His Saints, so amply stressed by Orthodox worship, constitutes a necessity for the Christian more than ever before. The spiritual exercises and achievements of the Saints, and their contribution in making the Christian life possible and practicable must be studied and presented anew. Their lives will help us to recapture again the sense of sin, the value of suffering, the joy of reconciliation with God, the light of Christ, the happiness of humility and the treasures of the Bible.

All these and many others are the subjects we hope to see discussed and explained in the pages of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, for, important as they are, they must be presented in terms of today and for English speaking readers, Orthodox and non-Orthodox.

Theological inquiry deals with God's revelation as it unfolds itself in timeless continuity. Whatever was true yesterday is equally true for today and for tomorrow. Speculating on God's actions and man's response in the past we acquire the directives for today and the insight for tomorrow. By leaving the facts of today unrelated with those of yesterday, we deprive ourselves of the dynamics of life which can be found only in God's continuous providential activity expressed in terms of human experience. The task of theology is, I believe, to interpret human experience, permeated as it is with Divine presence, and render the present and the morrow intelligible and worth living within God's design. Greek Orthodox thinkers and theologians have succeeded in the past to make people take a part in theological speculation and controversy by convincing them that it is everybody's business to inquire about both the human and divine. It is at this point where theology begins to influence not only the mind of the specialist but the life of the layman as well.

It is with thoughts and hopes as these that we greet THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW. We hope to see it recognized by all as the instrument of expression of Christian Orthodox thought in this Country, and as the measure of Orthodox theological contribution to the common task of the Christian Churches to bring together all things, both earthly and heavenly, in one, our Lord Jesus Christ. Κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἕνα καὶ τὴν δόξην αὐτοῦ (Ephesians 1:10-12).

With best wishes and blessings, I remain

most sincerely yours,

† Athenagoras

Bishop of Elaia

Los Angeles, California

September 14, 1954

family of the autocephaloi Orthodox Churches. The recent and sudden proclamation of the Bulgarian Church as a Patriarchate, however, makes one wonder whether her re-acceptance to full status justified in reality the hopes of the Mother Church in ending the Schism.

Prof. B. Joannides writes on "The New Commandment of Love and St. Paul's Ode in I Cor. chap. 13", pp. 199-264. The author spends his introduction on the concept of love in general and its necessity for a stable and self-harmonious life. Then he proceeds to examine separately the concept of love in pre-Christian times and ἀγάπη in its Christian context. Dr. Joannides finds that love in ancient Greece was always conceived in relation to an object laying within a restricted area of communal expression, i.e. within the nation, race, family, philosophical school etc. The Hebrew concept of love was of no wider application than the ancient Greek one, mixed in addition with a strong element of fear. The Platonic ἔως suffered heavily on account of its egocentric elements which left no room for a wider conception and application of human sentiment meant to govern eventually man's life. An analysis of Christian ἀγάπη follows, as presented in St. Paul's Ode of ἀγάπη with the conclusion that a comparison between love and ἀγάπη places the latter in a unique and incomparable position.

"The Nature and Content of Theological Research from an Orthodox Viewpoint", pp. 269-357, is the subject of Prof. B. Exarchos. Dr. Exarchos believes that the scope and the extent of theological investigations conducted by theological schools must be as wide as possible. They must not be restricted to the study of the "religious" element in the life of the Christian community but must include the totality of the spiritual life of the Church of Christ. In examining the meaning and development of contemporary civilization, Dr. Exarchos is confronted with the division of spiritual life into two fractions: the "worldly" and the "ecclesiastical." This breaking of the content and integrity of spiritual life has resulted, in the author's opinion, in a kind of "palinbarbarism", i.e., a return to barbarism. Theological schools, he contends, must under no circumstances become victims of this rapture, but they must strive to study "the whole of genuine Christian spirit." The Church will thus be appreciably helped in her great task.

"History and Revelation according to contemporary New Testament Studies", pp. 363-488, is the sixth treatise written by Prof. Siotis. The author contends that the Revelation of Christ must indisputably be taken as an historical fact to be properly understood only through the Church of Christ. Secular history, likewise, must be explained through the development of the Church, inasmuch as the most important event in world history is the Revelation of Christ through which the relation between finite and infinite are revealed. The Revelation of Christ, being the center of historical development, is examined by the author under the light of modern scholarship. Dr. Siotis' conclusion is that the meaning and purpose of world history is bound to be found only in the historical event of the Revelation of Christ.

The last contribution entitled "The Greek Church and the World of the Barbarians", pp. 449-537, belongs to Prof. P. Polakis. The author presents briefly the various phases of the Christianization of the Greeks of Euxenos Pontos (Black Sea), and of the Scythians, Slavs, Goths, Moravians and other people. This great task has been the work of the Greek Orthodox Church, and Dr. Polakis is sharply at variance with those of the Roman Catholic historians who try to minimize the importance of the missionary work of the Church of Constantinople. The greatest phase of this missionary movement on the part of the Church of Constantinople has been the Christianization of Russia for which the author gives full credit, as is truly due, to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. For centuries the Church of the capital of the Byzantine Empire continued to spread the light of Christianity to the North amid appreciable difficulties. The author appears justly indignant against any attempt to challenge the historicity of this fact and its sole connection with the Greek Orthodox Church.

All in all this volume contains some valuable contributions to the subjects it deals with. A synopsis at the end of each contribution would help the

student to summarize the substance of each treatise to the benefit of both the subject and the author.

A general index also would be desirable. We found far too many errata, some listed in a special page and others left to the reader himself to correct. The size of the book would certainly require a sturdy cloth binding.

N. D. P.

G. S. B.

NICHOLAS CAVASILAS, «*Ἡ Χριστιανικὴ Ζωή*». Translated into modern Greek. (Athens: Ἀδελφότης Θεολόγων «*Ἡ Ζωή*», 1954.) Pp. 106.

Nicholas Cavasilas (1290-1371 A.D.) is one of the outstanding writers of the Greek Orthodox Church. He is especially known as the author of this work, and as a champion of Orthodox mysticism, known in his time as "hesychasm", and a critic of its Westernizing enemies.

The original title of this work is «*Ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ ζωή*», but it has been changed in order to avoid confusing it with another, recently published book, which has the same title. To make it accessible to all the Greeks, its editors have translated it into modern Greek, have omitted certain portions that are concerned with liturgic and other theological matters which are of interest rather to theologians, and have added a very helpful introduction. It consists of a series of edifying discourses under various headings. Its purpose is to arouse the reader spiritually and to instruct him in the practical methods for growing spiritually, for embodying in one's self, in one's life, the truths of Christianity, for becoming united with God.

Our chief goal, says Cavasilas, is to achieve the "life in Christ", to make it, as far as possible, a reality here on earth. "The life in Christ" comes into being in this world. But it evolves and reaches its full maturity in the future life. "Those who depart from the earth without having acquired spiritual powers and senses, which are essential for the life in heaven, shall lose eternal blessedness and shall live in a world of immortality in the condition in which they happened to be at that time—miserable and spiritually dead."

The "life in Christ" requires the cooperation of two factors for its attainment: divine grace, which takes place through the sacraments, and man's aspiration and application. Cavasilas shows the nature and proper ways of participating in the holy sacraments, and the proper ways of directing our will, mind, and heart.

His style throughout is clear and elegant, and has been rendered well into a simple form of the καθαρεύουσα or "purist" Greek.

The present reviewer feels very happy that this work has been made accessible to the general Greek public and to all those who can read modern Greek. And he hopes that edifying works by other great but little known spiritual leaders of the Greek Orthodox Church will be published by the Brotherhood of Theologians «*Ζωή*», which has shown great activity in recent years.

Constantine Cavarinos

**Select List of Theological Publications
on the Orthodox Church
for the year 1954**

Abridged Euchologion

Abramtsov, Rev. David F.

Orthodox Catholic Literature Assn. — 120 pp. — \$3.00.

The Akathist Hymns

Athenagoras Kokkinakis, Bishop of Elaia

The original text with a translation and an introduction.

Los Angeles, Calif. — G.O.Y.A.

Christian Orthodoxy in the Home

Athenagoras Kokkinakis, Bishop of Elaia

Los Angeles, Calif. — G.O.Y.A. — 22 pp.

The Future of our Church in America

Athenagoras Kokkinakis, Bishop of Elaia

Los Angeles, Calif. — G.O.Y.A. — 16 pp.

In the Realm of Redemption

Athenagoras Kokkinakis, Bishop of Elaia

An Exposition of the Greek Orthodox Doctrine on the
Sacrament of Baptism.

Los Angeles, Calif. — G.O.Y.A. — 30 pp.

Byzantine Studies and Other Essays

Baynes, Norman U.

John de Graff — 380 pp. — \$6.50.

Truth and Revelation (tr. by R. M. French)

Berdiaev, Nicholas

Philosophical significance of Christian revelation, god-
lessness, freedom, transcendentalism; the relation be-
tween religion and history; for readers well acquainted
with Christian theological concept.

Harper — 156 pp. — \$2.50.

Saint Sergius in Paris

Lowrie, Donald

First 25 years in the life of the Eastern Orthodox Theo-
logical Institute.

MacMillan — \$2.50.

The Liturgy of the Orthodox Church

Sophocles, Rev. Dr. S. M.

Damaskos — Athens, Greece.

Faith of Our Fathers; the Eastern Orthodox Religion

Soroka, Rev. Leonid and Carlson, Stan W.

Olympic Press — 160 pp. — \$2.50.

**A Brief Explanation of the Holy Liturgy
of the Greek Orthodox Church**

Heliopoulos, Rev. Demetrius

Pittsburg, Pa. — \$5.00.

Rev. D. T. A.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Right Rev. Athenagoras, Bishop of Elaia

Bishop of the 3rd Episcopal District of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America with headquarters in Boston, Mass.

Rev. Dr. Nicon D. Patrinos

Dean Emeritus and Research Professor of the Greek Orthodox Theological Institute, Editor of *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*

Dr. John P. Cavarnos

Chairman of the Department of Greek at the Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

Rev. John Papadopoulos, Th.D.

Visiting Professor of Dogmatics and Moral Theology at the Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

Dr. Constantine Cavarnos

Professor of Philosophy at the Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

Dr. John N. Karmiris

Professor of Systematic Theology at the Divinity School, University of Athens, Greece

Rev. Zachary C. Xintaras

Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the Greek Orthodox Theological Institute

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.